THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MANY books, large and small, are being published by Christian writers who would in these days influence the shape of things to come. The burden of them is that we cannot look for stability and peace unless there first be a change in men's hearts. And this applies both to national and international life.

The writers are usually theologians or preachers by profession, but the book to which we here call attention—*Building the New Age* [1]—is by one who is neither theologian nor preacher but a lay teacher. He is Mr. E. B. CASTLE, M.A., Headmaster of Leighton Park School, Reading, and he has produced a wise and thoughtful book which fully maintains the standard of the publishers' 'Needs of To-day' series. He has read widely in the relevant current literature, and adds interest to his subject by a happy use of quotations.

There are chapters on the Family, the British Commonwealth, the International Society, and a Christian Co-operative Democracy. Perhaps the most valuable chapter is that on Education; for here the author is on ground with which he is specially intimate. But it will readily serve the purpose of giving an impression of the style and quality of the book if we give an account of the chapter on 'Christ and Society.'

It begins with the familiar thought that the quality of the new age which is abuilding will depend on men's response to Christ, or at any rate their willingness to test their social attitudes by a morality that is Christian. It is added, perhaps somewhat optimistically, that if men accept Christian standards of morality they are in the end bound to accept also the religious bases upon which Christian morality is founded.

The opinion is here expressed that institutional Christianity has emphasized personal salvation at the expense of social salvation as though it were a 'separate and sufficient' expression of the Christian religion. That was certainly the case until recent times. Even in recent times the Christian Church has in some quarters neglected the expression of its end and purpose in terms of social salvation. It is no wonder that, as our author notes, impatience with the Christian Church has led to the building up of a social gospel without any demand on the religious faith of the individual.

What then is the function of the Church in the social life of the nation? Where does the influence of the Church as a corporate body cease? Where does the work of the individual Christian citizen begin? The three questions are closely related to each other, and here is the answer to them our author would give.

The social function of the Church is to be prophetic, to proclaim the living Word, to be the power-house of Christian devotion and endeavour. As such the Church is the link between the life of faith and the life in the world. It prepares the individual Christian to fulfil his life in community, helping him to perform his secular duties as a normal Christian activity.

'The social function of the Church . . . is to unite all believers on a common front of righteous endeavour, making its influence felt far beyond the bounds of its own limited community, in the family, in office, factory and workshop, in education, in national and international institutions, and throughout the culture of a people. In this way the Church's influence will pass outside itself to those who stand either on the fringe or far beyond the fringe of any Christian allegiance.'

On this point there may well be agreement. But should the Church go beyond that ill-defined boundary where the religious merges with the secular and attempt to guide public policy in the political, social, and economic sphere? It is a question much in debate among us to-day, but our author has no hesitancy in answering it in the affirmative. He looks upon 'pious isolationism' as a denial of the prophetic mission of the religious community. He would not have the Church subscribe to party programmes or align itself with any class or State policy, but it would be a

[1] Rich and Cowan; 7s. 6d. net.

poor kind of Church, he says, which is so preoccupied with man's entry into the next world that it can neglect his welfare in this.

'This, then, is the final social function of the community of believers: it will enunciate principles out of which a noble social life can grow, but it will not elaborate details; it will initiate and point the way, but it will not plan; it will declare what is needed, but not how to supply the need; it will not hesitate to express its judgment on secular activities which depart essentially from Christian standards of equity, or to condemn wherever evil raises its head in high or low places. In brief, the sphere of the Church's social action is limited to the definition of ends; it leaves to the expert the elaboration of the means, but it will watch jealously to see that the means employed are likely to serve the ends in view.'

All this is very familiar, but it is good to have it stated by a layman; and readers of this book will learn how Mr. CASTLE would apply it in the various spheres of social relationships. Only if it is applied will a Christian society arise out of 'the wreck left by destroying armies and the unrepentant forces of Mammon.'

The British Council of Churches (which is the nearest thing we possess to a federation of the churches) has published a book dealing with the position and needs of the rural church, *The Land, the People and the Churches*.[1] The book is the result of three years' inquiry undertaken by a group of people set up for the purpose. Specially constituted village groups discussed (apparently with zest) questions submitted to them. One group which was typical consisted of the vicar, the schoolmaster, two farmers, a postman, a bricklayer, a butcher, a farmer's wife, two Methodist leaders, a farm worker. Men's unions (for example, the Farmers' Union) were consulted, as well as leading agriculturists and economists.

This is the main value of the Report now published. The Report deals with every aspect of rural life, its problems, its drawbacks, its communal life and activities, and particularly what part the Church may and should play in all this. We can here only summarize briefly some of the main conclusions to which the reporters have been led by the stream of information and theory which has poured into their receptive minds.

One broad generalization is stated at the outset about the religion of the countryside. The countryman, like the seaman, lives a life which is more obviously dependent on certain 'given' and unalterable factors than the life of the townsman. 'It takes ten months from sowing to reaping to raise a crop of wheat,' writes one farmer, 'and in all that time there is practically nothing you can do about it.' And the countryman is driven to a belief in a Power behind the forces that he sees daily at work, and among country people there is a strong conviction that this Power is a moral force and that in the long run there is a moral purpose.

In the second place there is deeply embedded in the tradition of the farming community a sense of moral obligation towards the soil. It is the farmer's duty to keep it in good heart and to practise good husbandry. This tradition has a religious foundation, for it is the recognition of the soil as a created thing, made by God for a purpose, for the care of which man is a steward.

At the same time it must be recognized that this religious sense has been weakened by modern tendencies. The scientific attitude has captured the minds of many among the younger generation. 'The farmer of to-day knows how to get good crops without praying over them.' High-power machinery, the use of chemical fertilizers, scientifically selected seeds, artificial breeding, emphasize the part which man can play in the subjection of Nature to human purposes, and God tends to be pushed out. There is, in these circumstances, says the Report, an urgent need for a re-statement of the Christian doctrine of creation. And this needs to be formulated not in theological language but in terms with which the young countryman or countrywoman is familiar.

The young man or woman whose interests are in the country is miserably served by Christian apologists. 'In fact,' says the Report, 'we think it right to say that they are not served at all, judging by the literature racks of country churches . . . yet we are convinced that the truly religious conception of the countryman's calling is in harmony with the full use of scientific knowledge applied to agriculture.'

The great body of this book is occupied with a review of country life in all its aspects, public and domestic. There is a great deal to interest and enlighten the churchman in this review of the changing and the unchanging countryside, of rural government, of the different religious traditions in the country and of the many-sided aspects of rural activities. But what is of most importance

[1] S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net.

for the churches is the series of convictions which have emerged from this intensive study of country life.

Behind the pride in the achievements of British agriculture during the war there is a growing sense that agriculture is something more than an essential war industry, that it is an indispensable element in our national life. 'We believe,' this Report says, 'that there is going to be a continuation of the revival of country life which began before the war, and that in this revival the churches have an indispensable part to play.' One of the suggestions repeatedly stressed in these pages is that the gospel the churches should present must include an emphasis on the fact that man will only find his true happiness when he recognizes that he is a created being, dependent on God and responsible to Him for the use he makes of His created gifts.

The churches have also something to say to that renewed seeking after a life of community which is evident in many places. But if the rural church speaks such a word, that word will have little influence unless the Church displays in its own life the pattern of a redeemed community. While different religious bodies within the village regard each other with a cold tolerance, men will not readily listen to the Church's insistence on the duty of love to our neighbours. No one expects the churches to think alike, and there is no likelihood of a speedy closing of the ranks. But there is in the country, perhaps even more than in the town, an urgent need of warm understanding and brotherhood among those who own the one Saviour.

Further this Report presses on the rural churches the need for a courageous social witness. The standard of living in the country has been much below that among industrial workers. The important part agriculture plays in the provision of food should be recognized in good wages, fair prices and leisure. Our richly fertile soil and the reservoir of skill we have in our agricultural community are gifts on which mankind depends. And the churches should take a prominent part in seeing that this is adequately recognized. There is an immense amount to be done to make life in the country what it ought to be, in housing, health, education, amenities of all kinds, and at this time of great opportunity the churches are being called by God humbly to renew their faith and to enlarge their service.

Reconciliation and Reality.

IV. Reconciliation between the Generations: 1. The Revolt of German Youth.

By Konrad Braun, Dr. Iur., Woodbrooke, Selly Oak, Birmingham.

The opposition of one generation to the preceding one, the clash between the views of individual young people with inherited conventions and traditions held sacred by those of mature age in control of family life and society, these are common experiences in the history of mankind and not confined to any particular period or country. It is different, however, and we may call it a phenomenon of sociological and psychological interest, when youth unites in a movement and in organizations whose members have only the one thing in common that they are young; when it asserts itself against the institutions and standards of the social order and puts forward claims for cultural, social, or political changes on the basis of the conviction that being young gives certain rights and qualifications. The German Youth Movement whose life dated from 1897 to 1933 deserves its name, as it was carried on by the young with little guidance of older people being offered or accepted, and as it aimed at a rejuvenation of national and cultural life. It shows many characteristic features of German mentality: enthusiasm and extremism, lack of clear direction, and the absence of a practical policy. Like other spiritual rebellions in German history this movement sprang out of idealistic motives and showed a noble spirit; but it allowed itself to be diverted from its original course by secretly hostile forces and eventually to be used for wrong aims.

For a better understanding of the Youth Movement it is advisable to have a look at some events which prepared its birth and influenced its development. In 1813, the rise of the German nation

against Napoleon had, as its vanguard, students from universities and scholars of the higher forms of secondary schools who took part in the 'Wars of Liberation' as volunteers and inspired their comrades with the ideas of liberty and national unity. Their hopes for constitutional reforms and a close union of the German states were, after the end of these wars, disappointed by the princes' reactionary and particularist attitude. In consequence, there was deep resentment among students and other young people. This found expression on the occasion of a national holiday of double significance, when, in October 1817, the anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig coincided with the tercentenary of Luther's first protest against Roman Catholic oppression. Coming from many parts of Germany, 500 students gathered on the top of a mountain in Thuringia where the venerable Wartburg of Lutheran fame stands, and, following the example of Luther who had burned the Pope's edict, they lit a bonfire and solemnly burned books and pamphlets condemned as un-German. (A travesty of this *Wartburgfest* was enacted when, in 1933, Nazi crowds burned the books of progressive writers in front of Berlin University.) The princes were frightened by the students' revolutionary spirit and suppressed violently their associations and other liberal groups. But Goethe rejoiced. 'Youth,' he said in one of his secret *invectives*, 'Youth has revenged your baseness; from all directions they came together and condemned you in their multitudes.' The movement of students and older schoolboys went underground and lasted for years. They called themselves 'Old-German Youth,' aimed at 'every human and national virtue' and cherished a mixture of ideas taken from the Middle Ages and the French Revolution. They made themselves conspicuous by a peculiar form of physical exercise, by old-fashioned costumes and long hair.

Under the influence of the Paris Revolution of July 1830, a group of German poets and authors raised its voice under the name of the 'Young Germany.' With fiery enthusiasm and by bitter satire they tried to stir up the German public against the illusions of Romanticism and the reactionary attitude of the governments. The German Confederation issued a decree suppressing their writings, and some of the leading Young Germans had to go into exile. This was not a purely literary movement. The liberation of humanity from spiritual and political bondage was the aim of these men. They were the first German authors to make politics a main subject of literature and contributed to the growth of tension which led to the Revolution of 1848.

During the second half of the nineteenth century German life and thought was dominated by elderly, if not old men. This was natural in a country whose political life was shaped by the supremacy of the State and whose economic life was highly organized. In spite of the establishment of the Reich in 1871, of the increase in national power and wealth, of the achievements in science and technology, many young people felt a deep dissatisfaction at the end of the nineteenth century. Life seemed somehow petrified and dead, civilization shallow. The Protestant Churches, closely arrayed behind dynasties and State authority, had lost not only the confidence but the interest of the masses. School life was felt to be oppressive and formal, as we see from the testimony of playwrights and novelists born after 1870. Socialism, embodied in the Social Democratic Party, was in the hands of professional leaders who asked for discipline rather than for a revolutionary spirit. Philosophy was represented by the universities, art and music controlled by the academies. The officially recognized literature presented a lifeless imitation of the classics; the more independent poets and authors either indulged in negative criticism of society or in a subtle aestheticism. The formality of social life, the weariness and stagnation of the age were felt all over Europe and deplored as *fin de siècle*. In Germany, however, a critic of modern civilization had given a most powerful expression, in fascinating and passionate language, to those feelings of disgust, those aspirations for new ideas and forms, to that longing for Life—Friedrich Nietzsche, whose *Zarathustra* was gaining popularity among the young members of the educated classes just at that time.

Against this background we have to see the birth of the Youth Movement and its first period. It started, however, not with a solemn protest nor with a programme, but in a modest way. In Steglitz, a Berlin suburb of middle-class character, a young student, Karl Fischer, gathered around himself a few boys of the grammar school and took them out for hiking excursions. He gave his group the inspiring name of *Wandervogel*, which means wandering bird or bird of passage. Universities without a system of colleges allowed students great freedom of movement, and schools, being nearly all day-schools, left the afternoons from 2 p.m. free; thus there was plenty of time for planning and discussing in addition to the Sundays which were used for hiking. Many similar groups came into being in all parts of Germany. When the school authorities began to frown upon the *Wandervogel* as a secret society, Fischer founded an association of parents, teachers, and other adult friends of his group, and had it registered. But the participation of adults was

only used for a formal protection against outside interference. The boys were determined to have their activities according to their own ideas. Wandering in free Nature, singing their songs, sitting around fires at night and cooking their simple meals—these were attractions for the romantic spirit of the youth of big towns. But they wanted more: new forms of social life, freedom from the conventions of the age, a new conception of friendship and leadership. Soon, and without any pressure from outside, many groups introduced abstinence from alcohol and tobacco as a self-imposed law.

The story of the *Wandervogel* as an association is only too commonplace. There were splits, competitive new associations, later on a reunion in a bigger league. Branches for girls came into being in 1907, and the question of common hiking and camping exercised the minds inside and outside the movement. Several youth papers were published. The following principles were more or less generally accepted: extension to the youth of all classes, inclusion of both sexes, abstinence, and self-government of the local groups. Fischer who took his terminology from the vagrant scholars of the Middle Ages accepted the title of *Grossbachant*; he introduced semi-military games and preached a fervent nationalism. But he found himself isolated before long, especially as he tried to assume unlimited authority. Deserted by his friends, he abdicated and emigrated to China.

By most outsiders the *Wandervogel* was regarded as the embodiment of the Youth Movement. But many different groups and associations sprang up spontaneously in the first fourteen years of the twentieth century. They all had in common their love of Nature and simple life, the shorts and open shirt collars of the boys and the 'reform dress' of the girls. Their members wore no hats; they carried lutes and guitars with long coloured ribbons. Some of them were extreme in their practices, indulging in what they thought to be a revival of Teutonic customs. They had, for instance, equinoctial fires on the tops of mountains which they danced round and jumped through. In some cases, it is said, nudism was practised on such occasions. But it would be wrong to draw far-reaching conclusions from occasional excesses or to think (as Mr. Leslie Paul does in his book *The Annihilation of Man*) that here were the roots of National Socialism. The ideas of political power, racial persecution and world conquest were foreign to the Youth Movement of that period, while it proclaimed individual responsibility and self-discipline.

Some ill-will and criticism were aroused. The school authorities were afraid of the spirit of rebellion. The Churches complained about the absence of Youth from Sunday services. Much indignation was expressed by reactionary members of the Bavarian Diet. But the Movement went ahead. In innumerable cases, the boys and girls had to overcome the resistance of their parents; but they were carried along by their enthusiasm and the conviction that here was something making life new and worth while.

There was an intellectual wing of the Movement which called itself the New Youth and produced a periodical under the title *Der Anfang* (The Beginning). An adult friend of that group, the progressive educationist Wyneken, was officially responsible, but the articles were written by boys of the sixth form of Berlin High Schools. It was a rather precocious paper. The authors refused to be pinned down to any political, semi-political or cultural programme. They claimed to fight for freedom and truth in school and home, in religion and sex. As to the latter problem, they rejected the conventional concealment and suppression of natural instincts and asked for free discussion, sublimation in creative thought and art, a frank and natural meeting of the sexes, and for more sports and physical training in schools.

On the 11th and 12th October 1913, representatives of many youth groups met on the Hohe Meissner, a mountain near Kassel. Around a fire they celebrated the 'Day of the Free German Youth' with solemn speeches and vows. At the same time the Kaiser was unveiling a huge monument to commemorate the centenary of the Battle of Leipzig. The celebration on the Hohe Meissner was a deliberate counter-demonstration, a revival of the Wartburg Festival, and a protest against official patriotism. In the declaration of the Free German Youth, as published in the *Anfang* in October 1913, we read: 'Youth has been excluded, until now, from the public life of the nation and has been offered the passive part of learning and a sham of social intercourse. It has been left in the position of an appendix to the old generation. Now it begins to assert itself. It tries to form its life independently of the lazy habits of the old and of the commandments of repulsive conventions. It strives for a way of life corresponding to the soul of youth which allows it to take itself and its activities seriously and to have a place of its own in the general cultural life.'

A year later, the First World War broke out and put an end to that first period. The Youth Movement had not achieved a new form of social life. But it had given the German public a new interest in problems of youth. It created a revival of folk dances and folksongs. A collection of

folksongs, called the *Zupfgeigenhansl*, was published in 1909, and before 1917 nearly a million copies of it had been sold. In interior decoration, a predilection for peasant traditions in pottery and furniture was fostered. The contact with literature had no great results; a second-rank poet, Hermann Löns, was the favourite of that generation which had not yet discovered Rilke and George. The greatest practical achievement was the creation of the Youth Hostel which developed from the *Wandervogel* 'nest.' Germany became the country with the best Youth Hostel system in the world; their number grew from 17 in 1911 to more than 2500 in 1930. The influence of the early Youth Movement on education was considerable and could be seen in the 'Free School Communities' and other experimental schools. The Youth Movement had contributed in a progress of public life which was expressed in the slogan describing the twentieth century as the 'century of the child.'

The War of 1914–18 meant an interruption of most Youth Movement activities. Most of its members joined the forces as volunteers; the youngsters of under eighteen carried on as well as they could. One event of the war must be mentioned as significant: the day of Langemarck when, in November 1918, several regiments of young volunteers were annihilated in Flanders. This sacrifice of German youth has become a legend in Germany, exalted by some people as an expression of self-denial, deplored by others as a senseless slaughter. We cannot think out how many potential pioneers of a better Germany were killed on that day and in the course of the whole war. But we know that they were missed badly in later times.

After the War an attempt was made to take up the threads. But it was not the same youth any more and no longer the same rigid system of society which had been opposed before. The passion of party politics divided the young people into hostile groups. The Socialists had tried to form a proletarian Youth Movement even before 1914; now they went definitely their own way, kept separate from middle-class youth, but were divided themselves into Social Democrats and Communists. All political parties had their own youth groups. The Churches, too, had discovered the importance of Youth and started Protestant and Catholic youth organizations. All sorts of public bodies were wooing the support of Youth. The official circles of the Republic showed a sincere interest in the well-being of the young generation. The Weimar Constitution of 1919 emphasized the rights of the child. In 1922–24, important acts were introduced, regulating on a national scale youth welfare and establishing special courts for young delinquents. The Youth Welfare Offices did excellent work. There was greater freedom in schools and family life as a rule, and the rigid separation of the sexes, as practised in the nineteenth century, had gone. Yet the less incitement there was for Youth to assert its own identity, the more young people were drawn into social and political controversies. One could still see a good deal of harmless hiking and outdoor life in the mountains and forests, on the lakes and rivers, but the underlying unity of thoughts and ideas had disappeared. Before long, the poison of racial exclusiveness began to invade the extreme national youth groups. Before 1914, the Swastika had been the badge of some youth organizations, because it was supposed to be of Germanic origin; now it was accepted by the *Völkische Jugendbünde* (leagues of youth based on racial ideology) as an expression of antisemitism. The *Jungdeutsche Orden* (Order of Young Germans) which imitated the medieval Teutonic Knights, but showed democratic sympathies, lost much of its attraction. The pacifist Hermann Paasche who tried to rally young people for the service of peace and tolerance was murdered in 1920. It is impossible to enumerate all activities and varieties of aims and ideas for which branches of the post-war Movement were formed. In spite of so many diversities, the German sense of organization made itself felt. More than a hundred Youth Associations were united in a *Reichsausschuss* (the National Committee of German Youth Associations) and, in 1932, it represented more than five million young people.

While still in opposition, the Nazis made a great effort to conquer youth. The saying that he who grasps the Youth holds the future was perverted, by Goebbels, into 'We hold the future, therefore we hold youth.' But the *Hitler Youth* (for boys) and the *B.D.M.* (League of German Girls) got a great influx only in and after 1933, when all the resources of propaganda were in Nazi hands. In the first months of the Hitler regime all youth groups of non-Nazi parties were suppressed; the Christian groups followed before long. The non-political associations were *gleichgeschaltet* or dissolved. Eventually, after some years, membership in the Nazi youth organizations was made, by law, compulsory for all boys and girls of ten years and over. The Youth Movement was replaced by the 'State Youth.'

One should not think that the Nazis appealed openly to the bad instincts of their young followers. On the contrary, they tried to utilize the inherent idealism of the young: comradeship and enthusiasm, service to the community and self

sacrifice as well as hero-worship and fervent nationalism. They spoke of honour and faith. They proclaimed Germany to be a young nation, National Socialism to make everything new, the young generation to be the 'guarantees of the future.' They made use of many ideas coming from the original Youth Movement: the young people had young leaders; they had symbols and solemn rites of initiation, songs and bands, camps and fires, celebrations of solstice and equinox. They gave the young people practical tasks, for instance collecting money, gathering salvage, all arranged in a well-organized system. The strongest and most adaptable youngsters were drawn into special schools where they were given every opportunity through physical and political training to become the future leaders of the nation.

Many boys and girls felt attracted, many became adherents of the new creed. But the Nazis never conquered them all, and they lost others in the course of their misdeeds and especially during the war. The natural opposition of Youth to one-sided teaching, the individualism inherent in Germans in spite of their love of external discipline—a discipline often self-imposed in order to overcome the instability which is connected with that individualism—made many young people resent and secretly reject the Nazi doctrine, when the first fascination had passed. Even before the second world war, official circles of the Third Reich were complaining about the young generation's indifference. During the war, the students' revolts in Munich, Greifswald and Königsberg showed not only heroic courage, but also a remarkable independence of mind among young men and women who had gone through ten years of Nazi teaching and propaganda. As we now learn from anti-Fascist teachers in Germany, it was difficult for the Nazis to find young leaders for the Hitler Youth after 1942. As far as one can see, the *Werwolf* organization seems to have failed totally.

German Youth, after the defeat of 1945, is confronted with tremendous difficulties. This time it will not have to reform society, but to build it anew on the ruins of the past. There is much goodwill, much idealism among young Germans. Will they be given a chance? Will they be left to despair or driven into some other kind of totalitarian extremism? What they need is not only the bare minimum of material existence: food, work, a home, a community, but a fulfilment of their spiritual longing, something worth living for and, if necessary, dying for.

The Youth Movement of 1897–1933 has not reformed society and has not lifted up the cultural and spiritual life of the German nation to a higher level. The only lasting result it has achieved is a special type of personality. You can see that Youth Movement attitude alive in men and women who are 'getting on' by now and in spite of the long interval of twelve years. It is a freshness of approach to the great questions of life, an awareness of the importance of social problems, a belief in social progress, an interest in the young members of society, which is peculiar to these people. This does not mean a unity in outlook, at least not in the political sphere. Some of them have been taken in by the 'youthful' mask of Nazism; others belonged to its sturdiest opponents, to the victims and martyrs of the years of oppression. But they have learned the art of remaining young, and those who can combine this art with the wisdom of maturity may be the pathfinders for new discoveries.

Literature.

THE HISTORIC FAITH.

The Rev. Henry Balmforth, Canon of Ely and Principal of Ely Theological College, offers in *The Christian Religion* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net) a popular account of the chieftenets of Christendom's historic Faith. It is a small book, but its aim is exposition rather than argument or defence; and though small, it is compact and full of substance. Its expository plan corresponds on the whole to that of the Apostles' Creed. We commend it to preachers and teachers not only as a convenient summary of the main Christian doctrines but also for its simplicity and moderation: the style is clear and untechnical, the standpoint tolerant and irenical. On some points, no doubt, one might want elaboration; but the author would disarm criticism by saying that this is by deliberate intention a short book. None the less there is one point on which perhaps more should be said. The great doctrines of the Faith, such as the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement, are founded on and bound up with the belief in the Resurrection of Christ; and it is perhaps unsatisfactory if the dogmatician is content to speak of the Resurrection as though it were on the same factual level as the Death.

It may be added that while the author stands by the historic Faith, he is in sympathy with the modern critical effort as directed upon the Biblical

literature, and sees no reason to deprecate it. Here, for example, is his comment on the story with which the Bible begins : ' The six days of creation are part of the setting in which the truth that God made the world is presented in " mythical " form ; they were probably fixed at that number by the writer, if anyone wants to know why there were six, to strengthen the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath rest on the seventh day. As far as Christians are concerned, the number is of no consequence whatever to the real import and significance of the story.' There are other things in similar vein in other parts of the book, such as are not usually found in brief expositions of this perennial subject of the nature of the Christian religion.

W. FULTON.

PROFESSOR SNAITH ON SOME O.T. BOOKS.

Professor Norman Snaith has continued his series of ' Study Notes on Bible Books ' with four volumes : *The Psalms : A Short Introduction ; Notes on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah xxviii.–xxxii. ; Notes on the Hebrew Text of Jonah ;* and *Notes on the Hebrew Text of 2 Samuel xvi.–xix.* (Epworth Press ; 2s. 6d. net each). The last three are primarily intended for examination candidates for whom these portions are prescribed. While, in the nature of the case, they cannot give the kind of help afforded, for example, by the S.P.C.K. texts, they are admirably adapted for their purpose, giving copious notes on grammatical forms and constructions, with discussion of the more important problems of textual criticism. There are points in which other scholars may wish to differ from Professor Snaith, but these are unimportant as compared with the great mass of material on which there can be no dispute, and these little books should be welcomed, not only by students but by others who find their Hebrew a little rusty and wish to refresh it.

Of the little book on the Psalter it is difficult to speak too highly. In its short compass Professor Snaith has compressed an admirable summary of all that a reader needs to know of Introduction to the Psalter. His own views have been stated elsewhere, and they are not obtruded, though they are not deliberately concealed. But the work of practically all important modern scholars is clearly described, often with sound critical remarks on it. A more pretentious work might easily have given far less, and this volume is to be strongly recommended to every one who wishes to undertake a real study of the Psalter.

T. H. ROBINSON.

There is something very attractive about everything that Dr. William Robinson, Principal of Overdale College, Selly Oak, writes, and no one could help feeling this when reading his latest book, *The Shattered Cross : The Many Churches and the One Church* (Berean Press ; 2s. 6d. net). The idea of the book is a good one. Principal Robinson thinks that what keeps the churches apart is that they do not understand each other's point of view and that the way to union is by a real understanding. There are three possible attitudes to the subject of union, the Principal says. The first is the exclusive, such as the Roman. The second is the sentimental, which says, ' differences don't matter, so there is nothing to keep us apart.' The third is the way of sympathy and comprehension. And so Dr. Robinson has set himself to give here an account of nineteen churches, seven of them with ' peculiar doctrines,' like Swedenborgianism, and three ' substitutes for Christianity,' Mormonism, Christian Science, and Spiritualism. Finally, he sets forth at length the tenets of his own church, ' The Church of Christ,' whose aim is the reconciliation of all others. This is a very valuable book, for Principal Robinson is a scholar, and a very able man, and his sketch of the different Christian bodies is full just of the sympathy and insight which he thinks the first essential to a closer union.

A vivid and sympathetic account of the life of a great Christian is given in *C. F. Andrews : Friend of India,* by the Rev. Nicol Macnicol, D.Litt., D.D. (James Clarke ; 4s. 6d. net). It is not a biography. That is to come later, but most people will feel that it is enough to be going on with. At any rate we get a real knowledge of the essential saint and apostle in this sympathetic and understanding sketch by one who knew both Andrews and India intimately. Three titles were given to Andrews which sum up the man and his career : Friend of India, Brother of the Poor, and Christ's Faithful Apostle, and these are the titles of the last three chapters of this book. The book itself is an inspiration. Within its brief compass it could not well be better done.

A charming book of familiar and social humour has been written by the Rev. William J. May and is called *More About Mary-Martha* (Epworth Press ; 5s. net). Those who have read the detective stories of which the heroine is a Miss Marple, will know the kind of book this is and the kind of person Mary-Martha is. She is a shrewd woman (what the Scots call ' pawky ') to whom all sorts of practical and domestic problems are submitted, and her solutions are not only wise ; they are given in a racy fashion which is delightful to read. The jacket says, ' Every village in Britain can boast of its Mary-Martha.' We doubt it. Life would be in every way brighter and richer if it were true. At any rate, don't miss this one.

Christian Unity (Inter-Varsity Fellowship ; 2s. net), by the Rev. G. T. Manley, M.A., is an attempt to give some guidance to students who find themselves baffled by the conflicting appeals of to-day on the subject which is the title. The author stands by the Protestant and Evangelical attitude. Starting from the premise of the final authority of Holy Scripture he proceeds to set forth the Scriptural doctrine of the Church and its faith and order as these affect the problem of its unity. Light is also sought from the story of the past and the

experience of the Mission Field in the present. In the latter part of the book the author seeks to apply to actual conditions the lessons so learned. The book is helpful and informative, written in a clear and simple style, and succeeds in being at once popular and scholarly. It is followed by a useful select bibliography.

We have received an off-print from *Mind* of July 1945, of the article *Obedience to Conscience*, in which the author, Mr. H. D. Lewis, University College, Bangor, leads his readers to the threshold of religion. The attitude he discusses is that of those who say that even if there is an ultimate right or wrong, yet every individual must be guided by his fallible conscience and the final answer for all practical purposes in ethics is subjectivism.

Under the new Education Act all schools have to include a session of worship each day. Teachers will naturally be on the outlook for help in this difficult matter, and *The School Service* (Religious Education Press ; 6s. net) has been compiled by Miss Doris Starmer Smith for this purpose. It contains fifty orders of service, and these have been drawn up with fine taste and catholicity. The book is divided into sections—God the Creator, God the Father, Jesus : His Life and Teaching, The Holy Spirit, Thanksgiving, Special Occasions (like beginning and end of term, Remembrance Day, Empire Day, and so on). There are suggestions about variations of the services for use by those who prefer free and non-liturgical worship. Holy Scripture is largely drawn upon, but classical devotions, poetry, prose from great authors, are also included. If any one finds the material sometimes a trifle above the ordinary thinking of children he will discover plenty that can be used on a more familiar level. This will be found a helpful volume.

Von Moltke once remarked that 'the ordinary person learns by his own mistakes—I learn from other people's mistakes.' The contributors to *The Junior Club Handbook* (Religious Education Press ; 3s. 6d. net) who quote this remark, say that they have an unparalleled knowledge of the mistakes possible in running clubs for children between eleven and fourteen, and their book contains the distilled essence of their experience. It is certainly an excellent book (compiled by the 'under 14's committee') and provides a guide to the organization of clubs for these under 14's. Everything you can possibly want to know about forming a club, running it, drama, painting, cookery, camping, religion, is here. The bibliography, intelligently classified, is invaluable. In short this guide is indispensable, and nobody who wants to have to do with clubs can do without it.

The Christian Way (S.C.M. ; 6s. net), by the Rev. Frederic Greeves, has been written in the hope that it may be of use to some who wish to learn about the Christian life, and also that it may encourage some Christians to fresh consideration of the need to commend that life. It is indeed the burden of the book that the Good News needs to be communicated ; so many are ignorant or mistaken concerning it. The results of life in the Way are tabulated as (i) a new relationship with God, (ii) a new self, or personal life, (iii) a new relationship with other people. This provides the scheme of exposition, which is rounded off with a discussion of the hindrances to hearing the invitation to the Way and of the entrance into the Way. On this last point the author, of whom it should be said that he writes with clearness and conviction and that he is in close touch with much current theological writing, prefers to use the great words of the Christian vocabulary, such as new birth, salvation, reconciliation, and atonement, rather than the apparently simpler word conversion. 'Psychology is a useful handmaid in the service of the soul, but the psychologist can neither explain the saint nor deal with the sinner.'

The Instability of Theism.

III.

By Emeritus Principal David S. Cairns, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Eternal Son and the Eternal World. There is yet another point at which the view of simple Theism seems to me intellectually as well as morally unsatisfying. In dealing with reconciliation we are concerned with the relation between God and Man, while here we are dealing with relations which transcend human experience, and passing into that region which Ritschl tried to bar against Metaphysics but which the Dialectical Theology has quite rightly crashed open again. In truth we cannot avoid entering into that high region and thinking of God as He is in His own Eternal Being. The New Testament does it when it says, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' St. Paul does it repeatedly in his doctrine of the Kenosis and the Christ by whom all things were created. Christian Theology in its greatest ages always has done it, and to its

credit simple Theism has made much of it to the profit of all serious thought to-day. And when assertions are made about God in His Eternal Being which conflict with what we know to be true of Him within the region of our human experience, we cannot take up a purely agnostic position without serious injury to faith. Now nothing is more central in the Christian doctrine of God than the faith that He is Love, Love that towards man appears as Grace. Here through Christ we have a broad shaft of light from the blue sunlit heavens striking through all the mists and clouds that arise from the human heart. Here we see God as He eternally is. That is what St. Paul means by 'the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' Now the simple ethical monotheism of the Unitarian Theology stands, as its name implies, by the unitary conception of God. God in His Eternal Being is solitary. Yet in that same Eternal Being He is Love. Is that a possible combination? There have been two answers to this question—the Theological and the Philosophical.

(1) I take, first, the Theological answer. God in His blessed Eternity contemplates and loves His own Perfection. That seems equivalent to saying that He loves—Himself. That is quite coherent with the further view that He orders all things for His own glory. Now a logical case may be made for this view. It is argued that for man it would be utterly wrong here to imitate God, for man is utterly unworthy of love, whereas God is supremely worthy. He is perfect, and for Him therefore His own glory must needs be His supreme concern. What else could hold the world together in harmony? It sounds rational. But how are we to harmonize with it the Divine Figure of the Crucified? How does it fit with Him who on the very eve of that death said, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father'? Did He cease to manifest the Love of the Father on the Cross or did the Love of the Eternal Father find there its supreme manifestation in the world of space and time? Christ on His Cross was certainly not seeking His own Glory. But if so, what becomes of this Narcissus-like God who is supremely blessed in the contemplation of His own perfection, and who 'for His own glory ordains whatsoever comes to pass'? Clearly there is something wrong with the logic. What is the flaw? Surely it is that the theologians have not considered deeply enough the essential nature of Love. For surely Love in its perfection is always the going out of oneself into the life of others or Another. If we do full justice to that obvious truth the very glory of God is His Love. In a sense we may say that He does all things for His own glory; but that is a misleading and unfortunate way of saying 'out of the splendour of His Love,' which laid all other glories by, that it might find its supreme expression on Calvary. But if He was this in His Eternal Being, can we, I repeat, think of that Eternal Being as solitary? As we try to conceive the Eternal Father does there not inevitably rise in our imagination, dimly it may be, but unmistakably—the vision of the Eternal Son. In any case the suggested option of the theologians, that God finds in His own perfection the sufficient theme for His own contemplation and love, is no real option at all.

(2) Is it any better with the option presented to us by some present-day philosophers—the option of an Eternal Universe as at once the object of the Divine Thought and the Divine Love? In its modern form, so far as I know, we owe his conception, or something like it, to Hegel. While the Church generally has refused to accept his explanation of the Trinity as in no way adequately representing its own faith, this part of it has seemed to some justly honoured philosophical Theists the most satisfactory solution of the problem of God and the world. We have to do here with a much more subtle and plausible alternative than the other. I, personally, owe so much to some of its supporters—Pringle Pattison, James Ward, Tennant and Temple—that I find it difficult to believe that they can be wrong and I right! Yet I must confess myself profoundly dissatisfied with their view of God and the world.

What is that view? It has been perhaps most clearly stated by Ward in his *Realm of Ends*. It is, in effect, that the world is eternally dependent on God, but it cannot be said to be created by God in Time, and there is no need to say it, for the essential thing is its Eternal dependence. This is quite distinct from the old Greek idea of an Eternal Hyle, or irrational matter, which is supposed to exist independently of God and out of which He has to make the best that He can. In Ward's view God is not the cause of the world, but He is its Eternal Ground. His conception seems to me to be akin to, though not identical with, that of Origen who believed in Eternal Creation. But Ward would only admit creation on the understanding that it did not mean more than Eternal dependence. He says, also, that the Absolute consists of God and the world. Pringle Pattison says roundly that the Universe is as essential to the existence of God as God is essential to the existence of the Universe, a view which is also taken by Tennant, and, although more guardedly, by Ward. Now it seems to me quite clear that eternal dependence is *not* equivalent to creation. I am unable to attach any meaning to that word if it does not mean the bringing into being of something *new*, and I cannot conceive

of anything new that does not imply a 'before' and 'after,' and this certainly either implies Time relations or 'something very like them.' And this Dr. Ward is not willing to admit.

But is this idea of an eternally dependent Universe really one in which the human mind can rest with any satisfaction? On the one hand the natural Universe being in process of evolution is obviously imperfect, and there is much evil of a darker kind in human history, implying man's misuse of the imperfect world of Nature. Of this twofold 'evil' there must have been the possibility in the Universe, even if it should be considered to be Eternal. In so far as this is the case we cannot call it Divine.

Yet of it three tremendous affirmations are made: (1) It is as necessary to the existence of God as God is to the existence of the Universe. This might mean one of two things. It might mean a kind of counterpart of the Divine Being essentially and fully Divine. This is not the meaning of any of these writers. Or it might mean a form of the Divine action. But is man simply a form of the Divine action? Surely that would be to deny his freedom. It seems to me that these writers have taken over from Hegel a very unmanageable conception that cannot be harmonized with true Theism. (2) The world is eternal. Both Ward and Tennant speak of it as 'Coeval with God.'[1] But surely Eternity is an essentially Divine attribute. It must, it seems to me, mean uncreated. And if it is uncreated must it not be Divine? (3) The only Absolute that we can admit, says Ward, is the Absolute which God and the world constitute.[2] In some sense this must mean that they are harmonized or unified in the Absolute.

The net result of these three affirmations, taken together with the very undivine elements in the Universe to which I have referred, is that on this scheme of thought that Universe appears as half in the Godhead and half out of it. In the Absolute we have a kind of quasi-Binity in Unity, a strange hybrid construction, surely, which is rather a device of the philosophers than a discovery of the Truth. We may, perhaps, compare the theory to one of those military pontoon bridges, of which we have been hearing much of late, which are useful temporary expedients, but which can never bear the traffic of great peoples through the ages, as can the massive structures of an older time.

I do not, therefore, find this an open option of thought, any more than the device of the Theologians. But is there any other thinkable solution of the problem set to faith and to thought by the Divine Unity and the Divine Love? I know of none and can think of none save in some form of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity. It lies outside the purpose of this article either to state the positive grounds for the doctrine or to consider its difficulties. As regards the former I have hardly touched on them at all. It was not along the lines of thought which we have followed that the Early Church came to the faith of the Nicene Creed. They reached it because the impression which Jesus of Nazareth made upon them and the new sense of communion with God which that brought with it was so great that it transformed their whole conception of Him. All that remains, whether the reasoning in these articles is true or false. As regards the second point, the difficulties of the traditional doctrine, all that I would wish at this point to say is that it may well be that in all its traditional forms the Church has been labouring with a conception of God too great for it to be adequately expressed in any of the thought forms current in the age in which the great Creeds took shape, and that the difficulties which to some seem insuperable are due to this cause. All that I would here urge is that these grave difficulties of simple Theism should lead to reconsideration of the whole question. This is, I think, rendered necessary by the whole position of modern thought. This leads me to the final point in the argument of these articles.

The Challenge of Science to Faith. In an impressive passage in his book *Natural Religion*, the author of the better known volume *Ecce Homo* rebukes the Churchmen of his Victorian day because they have not allowed the grandeur of the new Vision of Nature which science had given to modern man to influence enough the religious conception of God which they had inherited from pre-scientific days. The average scientific man, he maintained, was, under the name of Nature, really worshipping a greater God than the average Christian. 'In so many Christians the idea of God has been degraded by childish and little-minded teaching; the Eternal and the Infinite and the All-embracing has been represented as the head of the clerical interest, as a sort of clergyman, as a sort of schoolmaster, as a sort of philanthropist. But the scientific man *knows* Him to be eternal; in astronomy, in geology, he becomes familiar with the countless millenniums of His lifetime. The scientific man strains his mind actually to realize God's infinity. As far off as the fixed stars he traces Him, "distance inexpressible by numbers that have name."'

No doubt Seeley was here forgetting that Nature, at least as science was conceiving it, was impersonal and therefore unmoral. He was not really going

[1] Tennant guards this by prefixing to it the phrase 'if we are to use the language of time.' Ward, I believe, means the same qualification, though he does not state it (*The Realm of Ends*, 240).

[2] *The Realm of Ends*, 242.

back on the Theistic faith of his earlier volume, moreover. He repudiated this interpretation of his later book. But he felt profoundly that in the new vision of the vastness and glory of God's new revelation of Himself to the enraptured eyes of the kings of science there was something that demanded the attention of the churches of the age. They must think more greatly of their God. He is right in all he says as to the exceeding greatness and wisdom of God. It is impossible for any man to master, even in the barest outline, the wonderful story of Nature as science has brought it home to us to-day, without awe and wonder. The galactic worlds and the 'light years,' the æons of geological time, the miracle of life, the ever lengthening millennia of prehistory—how much greater is the Universe to-day than it was to Augustine or Thomas Aquinas or Calvin! What would they have said to it all? Would they have thought of God in precisely the same terms as we must think of Him? We do not know, but certainly if we are to believe in God as every rational being should believe in Him, we must believe that He is far greater and far wiser than they imagined. Is that all? What is the temptation of our age? It is to be so engrossed by the wonder of Nature that it loses sight of the Creator in the wonder of His works. And Nature, by the very character of the scientific method, whose fundamental postulate is Order and Law, seems to be impersonal in her working. This inevitably tends to colour the thought of the age about God. He tends, even in the minds of theologians, to become remote, a God who waits for men to find Him out through processes of reasoning rather than a God who comes, and who speaks to them 'face to face as a man talketh with his friend.' It seems to be incredible that so great a Being should care so much for so small a creature as man, that for his sake He should do so much. But surely there is something fundamentally wrong with the thinking which reasons that *because* we must think of God as so much wiser and mightier than the theologians of the past believed, we must think of Him as morally more commonplace. Surely the truer way is, instead of allowing the expansion of our thought of His wisdom and power to contract our ideas of His moral Being, it ought rather to expand them. That to my mind is the fundamental need to-day for all true Theism. Simple Theism has come a long way out of the vast confusion of thought of which I spoke in the first of these articles. It has triumphed and helped many to triumph over the aggressive Naturalism of the age. It believes in the All Perfect, as well as Almighty One, and it believes in the immortality of the soul, a confession which at once makes man qualitatively different from and superior to the intimidating but transient magnitude of Nature. Why should it quail when it comes to the Incarnation of the Son of God? For if it is really worthy to respond to the summons of the new revelation of the greatness and wisdom of God which He has given us in the development of science, by expanding all its thoughts of the Divine mind to a like dimension, it ought to pass on from the God who waits to the God who comes. For Christ has made it impossible for them as for us to think of the moral perfection of God in any other terms than in those of Holy Love. But Love is always a going out of oneself into the life of others, and helping this life and bearing its burdens. It is always, if need so demands, ready for sacrifice. Otherwise it is not Love. So if we expand all our thoughts of God to the new dimension of the great Universe, it seems to me that instead of the splendour of the new frame killing the picture, it is only now that the picture has a frame worthy of its Divine splendour. Instead of fading out in the vastness of the heavens and the wonder of the earth the Cross of the Incarnate Son is returning again as the only adequate symbol of that Divine 'Love that moves the sun and all the stars.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Splitting the Atom.

By the Reverend T. E. Edmond, M.A.,
Little Heath, Potters Bar.

'Except ye be converted, . . . ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'—Mt 18^3.

Do you do chemistry at school? Do you remember what the first chemists were called? Alchemists. They believed among other curious things that there was a red stone, called the Philosopher's Stone, which, if dissolved in alcohol, would, as the Elixir of Life, give the secret of Eternal Youth. They also believed that they held the knowledge, which would finally give men the secret of turning base metals into gold.

A wonderful thing has happened, as the war ended. The Atom has been split. For years great scientists have been on the track of this discovery. Centuries ago, at the time of the Alchemists, men believed that all known elements in the world

could be reduced to about ninety. Later on, they thought that the number could be much reduced. And during the last forty years scientists have believed that the Atom, the smallest particle of all, could be divided again. Atoms, we are told, are made up of particles, electrons and neutrons, moving at a tremendous pace. They are charged with electricity. An electron can only exist if it travels at the rate of at least 600 miles per second. So Sir John Anderson said, 'An entirely new force has come into being. It is not merely a development of what has gone before. It is absolutely new.'

Now that the Atom has been split, every one is expecting marvellous things to happen. It will alter everything, they say. We shall be able to travel to America in 17 minutes! We shall not need coal to warm our houses, the Atom will do that! We shall not need petrol to drive our cars, a small golf ball full of atom mixture will do that! What a new and amazing world it will be! So long as the discovery is put to good uses it will be a marvellous world. Oh, and I heard another good idea too! Somebody said to me, 'and of course the Atom will be able to turn all base metal into gold!' In that case, then, the old Alchemist's dream will have come true at last!

But the religion of Jesus has claimed to change base metal into gold for nearly two thousand years. It has claimed to be able to change ignoble character into precious material; to turn bad people into nice people; to convert evil tempers into gentle ways; and to make selfish boys and girls into thoughtful and courteous ones. The gospel of Jesus not only claims to do this, but it has done it over and over again.

Our blessed Lord is always changing people. What makes the long story of Christianity so thrilling is that it is the story of changed people. Impetuous Peter was changed to the zealous and enthusiastic Apostle. Fiery Saul of Tarsus was changed to the untiring St. Paul. The centuries only add to the wonderful stories of the conversion of base metal into precious gold.

When Dr. Grenfell was a young medical student in London he resolved that he would dedicate his gifts to the service of God and mankind. We all know how much the people of Labrador owe to that conversion. When Agnes Weston sat in a little church in Bath, she decided to consecrate her life to God, instead of living a life of pleasure. We all know what that conversion has meant to the sailors of Britain.

Our Lord can change you, if you let Him. If you love Him enough and try to obey Him in everything, you too will find that what is base in you will be turned into gold. The atom can't do that: He can. Will you let Him try?

4-H.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'With all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind. . . .'—Lk 10^{27}.

Suppose I were to ask you what 4-H means, I imagine scarcely any of you would be able to answer. It's a very mysterious sign, isn't it? It isn't a scientific symbol, although it may look like it. No! It's a badge with a motto built up around it. Our American cousins—I always like to call them that, for they speak the same language as we do—with variations—have what they call 4-H clubs, which are open-air organizations for young people, young farmers in particular. All members of them have to make a vow of 4-Hs. Shall we take them in order?

Of the covenant they made No. 1 H is, 'I vow my HEAD to clear thinking.' Think! That is very needful advice. After all, one cannot accomplish much unless one's head is used for thinking.

> Back of the beating hammer,
> By which the steel is wrought,
> Back of the workshop's clamour
> The seeker will find the Thought.

Only, of course, we shouldn't confine ourselves to such thinking alone. Surely we ought to have high thoughts also. St. Paul, remember, in one of his letters told us to 'think on' the things that are true, honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report. In order then that we may live the good life, let us 'think on these things,' and on Jesus, who is the perfect picture of them all.

Now let us go on to the second H, which is this, 'I vow my HEART to greater loyalty.' And loyalty is a lovely virtue. One ought to be loyal to one's friends, for instance, just as Jonathan was. And we should be loyal to our native land, with such loyalty as an Indian Prince, who, when asked during the perilous years of the Indian Mutiny whether he would stand by Britain, at once replied, 'As long as I live I am yours.' And above all loyal to our Lord and Master Himself and, as somebody said, 'to the royal' in ourselves, that is, to the best we have it in us to be.

Now to go on again, the third H is, 'I vow my HANDS to greater service.' And how marvellously useful hands are, working hands, serving hands, helping hands. For what it says in a tiny tots' song is very true:

> Four fingers and a thumb,
> It's wonderful the things they've done.

Therefore will you see what yours can do, for others and not only for yourselves, and for Christ your Saviour, for, bear this in mind,

> He has no hands but our hands
> To do His work to-day.

And the last H of the vow of these young Americans is, 'I vow my HEALTH to better living for club, community and country': though for you and me and all who claim to be Christian should we not add 'and for Christ our Captain'? And there is no doubt that to aim at having a healthy nation is wise. All of us can do more for our country and community when we are well and in good health, although there are cripples and invalids and not very strong folk who have played a very gallant part, too. And health is, of course, a Christian ideal, for the Bible says our body is a 'temple.' So for the sake of God who created us

and for Christ our Captain we must never be careless about our bodies and must try to maintain them in good health. This is what one of our Canadian cousins wrote about it :

To make my body a temple pure
In which I dwell serene ;
To care for the things that shall endure,
The simple, sweet and clean.

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

A Sense of What is Vital.

BY THE REVEREND FRANK W. MOYLE, M.A.,
ALLESLEY RECTORY, COVENTRY.

' That ye may approve the things that are excellent.' —Ph 1^{10} (R.V.).
' Testing things that differ ' (Weymouth).
' Able to appreciate all moral distinctions' (Twentieth Century New Testament).
' A sense of what is vital ' (Moffatt).

In two of his letters St. Paul uses that phrase. Writing to the Romans, he says that the Jews made that claim for themselves, that they had ' a sense of what is vital in religion.' Writing to the Philippians he says that this is his prayer for them, that their love may get richer and richer in knowledge and all manner of insight, ' enabling you to have a sense of what is vital.' Could a preacher pray a more important prayer for his hearers ? That is his real job. Not to fill people up with doctrines, but to help them to acquire a sense of what matters most in life. What a lot of religious controversies would be avoided if people had that sense ! What a lot of divisions in the Church would have been saved if people had been able to agree upon what are and what are not essential beliefs. Richard Baxter used to say that the plague of the Church for a thousand years had been the enlarging of the Creed by the making of more fundamentals than God ever thought of. Bishop Lightfoot of Durham said : ' There is nothing so dangerous as the desire to make everything right and tight. I find that my faith suffers nothing by leaving a thousand questions open so long as I am convinced on two or three main lines.' Dr. Major's little book, *Basic Christianity*, is an attempt on this line. He takes us back to the fundamental teaching of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, and the Parables about the Kingdom of God. We come from his book with the feelings of one who has walked up the dried-up bed of a long winding stream and at last come to its source among the hills.

It is quite clear from the Gospels that Christ's first disciples were critical of His method of teaching. ' Why,' they asked, ' do you speak to them in parables ? ' They felt that He was missing His opportunities. Here was an eager expectant crowd hanging upon His lips. They would take anything from Him. Why wrap the truth up in stories ? He need have no fear of being thought over dogmatic. I think Oliver Quick in his book, *The Christian Sacrament*, has given the best interpretation of Christ's answer. He writes : ' It may be that so sure was His faith in Rationality and so deep the insight of His reason, that He deliberately preferred to wait for men to see the truth by the light of their own reason, rather than to force it upon them prematurely by inducing in them the uncritical acceptance of anything He might choose to say. He may have known that the deepest truth is not truth at all unless it is born through the long travail of the minds which in the end come to recognize it as their own, and that He could never be the Son of God to men unless their whole experience of Him and of the world drove them to fashion that title for Him of themselves.'

It is significant that the Sermon on the Mount itself, which is the nearest thing we have to deliberate doctrinal teaching, ends with a parable, the parable of the wise and foolish builders.

The Sermon on the Mount is a description of the building up of the Christian life—in itself, in relation to the Father God, and in relation to other people, and in conclusion Jesus gathers it all up and compares, as one who was a Carpenter and Builder most of His life naturally would, the building of our life to the building of a house.

Now if you are going to build a house there are a few vital matters which must receive the closest attention. First, obviously, there is the foundation. In His little picture of the houses of the wise and foolish builders it is to be noticed that upon both of them ' the rain descended, the floods came, and the wind blew.' The difference between them was in the way they were able or unable to stand up to the elements. And that depended upon the foundations. Jesus says that His teaching in the Sermon on the Mount is the only foundation upon which to build the house of life—every other foundation is nothing better than shifting sand.

This is strangely at variance with our recent modern emphasis. In *Faith in Dark Ages* Dr. Barry writes : ' In the distracting years between the wars we have been obsessed by the difficulty of " applying " the teaching of the Master to the moral condition of the actual world. But that was never the content of the gospel. The good news that thundered across the Roman Empire and brought back hope to a disillusioned world was not prescriptions about Christian conduct : it was " Jesus and the Resurrection." '

Precisely ! The Sermon on the Mount never has been treated as ' the content of the gospel.' That is why Europe has never been anything more than nominally Christian ever since the fateful (and I think fatal) day when Constantine made it the official faith of his empire and the age of creedal dogmatism dawned upon a lazy-minded credulous world that found it much less trouble to subscribe to a creed than to go through the mental travail which Jesus in His parabolic teaching demanded of His hearers. In that sense G. K. Chesterton's epigrammatic word is true :

'Christianity has not been tried and found wanting: it has been found difficult and not tried.'

The Master Himself in that same Sermon on the Mount warned us of this precise mistake: 'Many will say to me . . . Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in thy name, . . . then will I profess unto them, I never knew you. . . . Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' Nothing angered Him more than this lip-service, 'Lord, Lord.' 'Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?'

Think not the faith by which the just shall live
Is a dead creed, a map correct of heaven,
Far less a feeling fond and fugitive
A thoughtless gift, withdrawn as soon as given;
It is an affirmation and an act
That bids eternal truth be present fact.

So Hartley Coleridge and so Christ Himself.

The Sermon on the Mount, like the Christ who gave it, must become incarnate before He can save the world. For all down the long strand of history upon which the tempests have beaten we hear the crash of philosophies, systems, creedal structures built upon the shifting sands of human ingenuity and ecclesiastical statesmanship, and we do not yet see, except in our dreams, the city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God.

The house of life, then, is to be founded upon a quality of life such as we see in the Beatitudes. A balanced life detached from riches (poor in spirit), attached to people, sensitive to their pain and sorrow (mourners). A poised life which is righteous but never self-righteous, hungering and thirsting after goodness but always a goodness tempered by mercy—and how unmerciful and hard have been the types of character produced by the dogmatist! A God-centred life because its vision of Him is clear; the builder of this house has kept his windows clean, his outlook single, disinterested, appreciative, 'pure' in intention and purpose. A stable, imperturbable life that can face the bitter rain and storm and tempest of denunciation, persecution and slander, and remain a house of peace, reconciliation and healing. 'Blessed are the peacemakers.' 'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' Let us return, as we build the house of the future, to Him who alone can give us a sense of and an insight into what is vital.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Frustration or Fulfilment: A Study in Obedience.

BY THE REVEREND C. E. MARVIN, M.A., WHITLEY BAY.

'He humbled himself, and became obedient.'—Ph 2^{8}.

Paul could never forget his great experience on the Damascus Road. It coloured everything he had to communicate about Jesus Christ, who meant all the difference to him between victory and defeat. Standing now in the assurance of the forgiveness and of the love of God, he found it all joy to labour, even as a bondslave, for Him who had brought to pass his release from what he elsewhere calls 'the body of this death.' Hence, in this great passage, Paul claims for his Saviour the title Lord.

With that past creative experience the Apostle combines his ever present sense of the Living Christ, in whom he feels divinity to inhere. For this reason also there must be attributed to Him the title 'Lord,' a name which is vested with exaltation and glory. 'Every knee shall bow' to Him; and, though these words can be read as a quotation from Isaiah, the Apostle has stamped the imprimatur of his own approval upon them. In the Christian communities which derived their ideas of 'Lord' from its Old Testament use in relation to Jahweh, Paul would be taken to mean that to Jesus belongs universal worship and dominion; but always (in the interests of monotheism) 'to the glory of God.'

The same tremendous impression is left with Christians down through the ages. Their Lord is more than a teacher. True, He has great ideas to drive home, ideas which have 'lifting power.' No one has taught more clearly the absolute worth of human personality and God's concern for it. It is, however, what He is in Himself that ensures for Him the unique place He occupies in our worship. Claiming to be 'the light of the world,' He continues to achieve the objectives of light. He reveals what is hidden, awakens what is slumbering, and purifies what is diseased. Like the sap which, under the influence of light, rises in the stems of plants to bring into being new forms of creation, so His influence raises men to the new and exciting plane which we know as 'Life Eternal.'

It is therefore remarkable that One for whom such great claims are made should prefer to describe Himself as 'Son of Man.' He seems to bid us estimate our own nature in the light of His and to regard the detailed difficulties of our lives as capable of solution in Him. It is the fact of Christ that makes for an intelligible doctrine of man.

Thus, the obedience of our Lord has much to teach us about ourselves. The word 'obedient' in essence implies self-renunciation. According to the derivation, the obedient are 'those who listen near-by' someone, to interpret in action as completely as possible what they hear. Unfortunately we turn our ears to more than one voice at a time. We allow the serpent's words place with those that God has spoken. The result is a divided allegiance and *a sense of frustration.*

In this connexion it is well to remember that the good is the enemy of the best. Certain lawful rewards of life (such as economic competency, reputation, home-comforts) are so obviously good that we scarcely give heed to other values which nevertheless persist in whispering to him 'that hath ears to hear.' Indeed, people are inclined to suspect actions and motives which are not

directed to immediate personal gain. When they hear of the religious man they wonder what he is 'making' out of it. 'Doth Job fear God for nought?' Jacob's tit-for-tat faith, with his 'If thou wilt keep me . . . then thou shalt be my God,' they can admire. Give them the religion that gets things done, that secures big dividends, that ensures success in this life; show them prayers definitely answered, and they will begin to bargain for a share in such a real harvest. There was, let us admit, obvious reality about those apples in Eden; but one questions whether they were worth the price paid.

Half-and-half obedience will always result in a sense of frustration, if not actual misery. The trouble with most of us is that we like to choose the terms and context of our obedience. Saul would kill the rest of the Amalekites, but not Agag. Jonah will be glad to go anywhere except to Nineveh. The disciples of Jesus are loyal, until they see how uninviting is Calvary.

We fully sympathize with such limitation of loyalties. Look what it cost Jesus! He was obedient, but it was unto death, the death of the Cross at that! What the ancient world thought of crucifixion is revealed, among other places, in one of Cicero's speeches: 'May the very name of a Cross be far removed not only from the bodies of Roman citizens, but even from their thoughts, their sight, their hearing.' 'The *death* of Christ,' we lament. 'How tragic! So much for the rewards of obedience.' Think of your Peters and Silases in prison for their loyalty; of Niemoeller in the concentration camp; of thousands killed in the war into which a sense of duty led them; and the case for disobedience to the so-called higher vision seems complete. It is not worth while.

Disobedience, however, cannot satisfy. It, too, has its consequences. Dr. Johnson was never happy that as a boy he had refused his father's request to go to Uttoxeter market. Appetite grows by what it feeds on, it is said. The guards of a concentration camp soon tend to become dehumanized. To live in the dark is to end by losing our eyesight. Dickens, with sure touch, portrays Dr. Manette in his relapses as lost without his cobbling. The end of the war has inevitably seen a 'slump' in enthusiasm for self-sacrifice. The great ordeal is over; and people are conscious of weariness. They have grown big enough to bear real burdens and to share in great tasks. In place of a common ideal we are putting sectional interests. It is as though Simon of Cyrene's great strength should be given to carrying not the Cross but only one or two nails. There is a disobedience unto death; and that death is none the less real though we may be unaware of it. Where there is separation from God existence may continue, but not life.

Whole-hearted obedience, on the other hand, leaves us with *a sense of fulfilment*, with the possession of life that is life indeed. In the light shed upon our nature by Christ it pays to be obedient no matter what the cost may be. There is a self-interest that life permits; otherwise the creation of selves would have no relevance, and from His other works we know that God does not deal with irrelevancies. For mutual advantage and protection of interests various political and social groups emerge. Provided these involve injustice to none, we do not cavil. The interests that are paramount in the world, however, are surely those of its Creator. Unless we adjust ourselves to His purposes we cannot have peace. Limited adjustment is of little or no avail. Complete obedience is in our own interests.

Virtue, despite the philosophers, is not coldly remote from rewards. Consequences inevitably follow causes, for good as surely as for evil. The professing Christian is told that by following Christ he is to 'accept all the good things that are ours in Him.' It is sheer folly to deny the rewards of obedience. God's right is not our wrong.

Those who, like the heroes of faith listed in He 11, obey God not for reasons of reward but because of an inward compulsion, find that in giving themselves they realize themselves. Paul said: 'I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision.' It was when his obedience brought him often so near to death that he discovered how full life was. Peter and Silas may be in prison, but they can sing at midnight. Sing in such a place, at such an hour! If the concentration camp confines the body of a Niemoeller it has nothing over the Spirit which gave him the power to hold fast to that which is true. In the war many fell; but the death that we deem to be the end is not so to God. The only real death is separation from Him. It has nothing to do with physical decay. Obedience keeps us in the realm of life. God is certainly not less faithful than the best of us.

We cannot, of course, claim such high privilege as Christ, who was exalted to Lordship over all, to God's glory. What we can say is that He who by His perfect obedience has attained to such authority is able to fulfil every promise He has given to His faithful people. What He has been able to begin in us here, through our obedience, He will not cancel hereafter. 'I go to prepare a place for you.' His obedience is towards God, but it is on our eternal behalf. In our Eternal Lord and Saviour is our true fulfilment.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Triumph of Righteousness.

BY THE REVEREND C. LESLIE MITTON, B.A. M.TH., NOTTINGHAM.

'[Jesus said] What then is this that is written, The stone which the builders rejected, The same was made the head of the corner? Every one that falleth on that stone shall be broken to pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust.'—Lk $20^{17.18}$ (R.V.).

It is with these words that Jesus rounds off and applies the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen. The priests and elders, who are in the audience, recognize that it describes the conflict between Himself and them. It reflects their

secret decision to get rid of Him. They are the builders, and Jesus Himself the rejected stone, 'despised and rejected of men.'

This rejection must have been a severe disappointment to our Lord, but it was not a cause of despair. In all the darkness of apparent failure Jesus knew that it was not He, but they, who had failed. At the heart of what He stood for was something utterly indispensable, something so strong as to be indestructible. Time would vindicate Him, because He represented God and God's way of life, and no other way would work satisfactorily.

This is the meaning in the words which He quotes from Ps 118. There a stone is described as first rejected, and then eventually chosen to become the keystone of the building. After the quotation Jesus adds His own words of warning: that the stone will be the undoing of those who do not give it its proper place.

Arthur Henderson wore himself out seeking to establish through the League of Nations a system of law between the nations by which disputes might be settled without war. The nations acknowledged the greatness of his ideals and endeavours by electing him Chairman of the World Disarmament Conference. They gave him an empty honour, but they declined to follow his lead. On his death-bed he said: 'They wouldn't take my way. But they will have to come back to it—after waste and suffering that cannot be measured.' The years have already proved the truth of those prophetic words.

It is a precisely similar thing that Jesus is here saying, though He refers to something much bigger and more far-reaching. Referring to what we might call the Christian standards of life, He says: 'You won't take My way, but you'll have to come back to it. And the price of rejecting My way will be waste and suffering.'

That is the important truth behind these words of the text. Acceptance or rejection of the way of Jesus is not just a matter of personal preference; it is a decision of the greatest consequence. Any structure which is to endure must have the spirit of Christ in it. Any structure which has anti-Christian things built into it, will be unstable and insecure, and its collapse will bring misery to all who are associated with it.

To make Jesus Christ the Head of the Corner does not mean merely to consent to use His name and the symbols of the Christian faith, though these will help. It means to accept His faith and His way of life, and to make what He stood for the ruling authority in our lives.

One cannot attempt to enumerate here all that He stood for. There are, however, three things worthy of emphasis, because in our day they are in danger of being 'rejected.' In fact we can already see in part the beginning of the misery that will follow such a rejection. The three are: (1) Chastity, (2) Honesty, (3) Goodwill to men of *all* nations. Many other things might be added to these, some less elementary than these. But at any rate there can be no doubt that Jesus stood clearly for each one of these three.

(1) *Chastity.* The Christian standard claims for marriage the utmost reverence, and affirms that all sex-relationships outside marriage are wrong. Such forbidden relationships are rightly called adultery and fornication, and less unpleasant names fail to do justice to the evil things they are. This Christian standard is being in some measure rejected in these days. But we can be sure that such rejection will bring with it misery and ruin. Already we see the first signs of it: an alarming increase in Venereal Disease, so that the Government has felt it necessary to issue prominent warnings against it; one in every nine babies born in recent years has been conceived outside marriage; from this results either illegitimacy or a marriage into which two young people go reluctantly in order to give a show of decency to the birth of their child; homes broken by unfaithfulness, and as a result children unnerved and emotionally crippled by the breakdown of the security of their home life.

Unbelievers may sometimes represent married faithfulness as tame and timid. Actually it is a virile and solid contribution to the true welfare of society, as well as being the only secure foundation for the structure of our own personal life.

(2) *Honesty, in word and deed.* This is another Christian standard which is in jeopardy. Everywhere the epidemic of pilfering has been spreading. One judge, dismayed at the evidence of its increase, cried: 'Are we becoming a nation of thieves?' In some towns people are warned to expect cycle thefts and to take certain precautions, so that in the event of the theft the cycle may be more easily traced and recovered. Once there was general recognition that lying and stealing were wrong and disgraceful. Now an attitude is growing up which says: 'Other people do it, and I shall be the loser if I don't do it. So if others do it to me, I shall do it to some one else.' Such a tendency bodes ill for our common life. Instead of the mutual trust, respect, and generous goodwill which marks community life at its best, we shall find our common life poisoned by suspicion and distrust.

(3) *Goodwill to men of all nations.* Jesus emphasized this by word and action. In fact some of the hostility He incurred was due to the goodwill He showed to foreigners and minorities who were generally despised and hated. He calls upon His followers to display the same attitude as He showed—goodwill towards all, even towards enemies. This does not mean an easy-going indifference to their moral wrong-doing. But it does mean that, whether it be through just punishment or forgiveness, we shall earnestly seek their true well-being. He calls for goodwill towards minorities who are disliked, for example, the Jews. This does not mean being blind to their faults, but it does mean being fair. For example, it means noticing Jewish names in awards for wartime gallantry, as well as in lists of those convicted of 'black-marketing.' It means withstanding every tendency that seeks to stir up antagonisms based on racial prejudice. In the rivalry between

white and coloured people it means working for understanding and reconciliation.

This Christian way is not the easy way, and sometimes it seems beset with dangers and great difficulties. But one thing we may be sure of: if the Christian way looks difficult, the un-Christian way leads headlong to disaster.

Vera Brittain describes a visit of her friend, Winifred Holtby, to South Africa. There she sensed at once the bitter racial antipathy between black and white. Five and a half million black people were being kept in a state of inferiority by one and a half million white people. Hatred and fear smouldered in the people's hearts. The whole atmosphere was charged with tension. She wrote: 'The situation here is quite terrible.' The acute discomfort of the smouldering resentment and the foreboding of coming upheavals made her utterly miserable. Then, in her travels, she came to Lovedale Mission. Here was something quite different. She found a small number of white people living in the midst of twenty thousand natives, yet with the most complete ease of mind. These white Christian missionaries slept confidently on the ground floor with open windows and doors. They walked out alone and talked freely with the natives. She was deeply impressed with the sane and serene atmosphere of the Mission as compared with the apprehension and hatred everywhere else.

Christ came into the world to make known the righteousness of God, and to offer to men the means by which this righteousness may be realized in human life. His way is the only way human life will work, because it is God's way for us. If we build our individual lives and our communal life according to His way, if we make Him the keystone of our structure, all will be well in the long run. It is the way to true social security and serenity of mind.

If, on the other hand, we reject Christ's way, whether from fear or selfishness or worldly wisdom, what we are trying to build will have a fundamental weakness, and the omission of the one true keystone will be our ultimate undoing.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Fearfulness.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM BARCLAY, B.D., RENFREW.

'Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?'—Mt 8^{26}.

Paul Tabori in a book called *Epitaph for Europe* described the spirit of his countrymen in the days immediately before the war. 'They have lost two things,' he wrote, 'the courage of the heart and the laughter of the unafraid. They laugh at the wrong thing and their courage is that of a man whistling in the dark—it may vanish suddenly leaving him with his knees turned to water.' There have been certain ages in history which have had a placid, easy, comfortable sense that all was well; and there have been others when there has been an atmosphere of nervous and fearful apprehension. The first age to which Christianity ever spoke was a fearful age which, as some one has put it, was seeking everywhere 'a ring wall to defend it against the chaos of the world'; and, in that, history is repeating itself to-day.

In the story of the storm on the lake there is given to us an insight both into the causes and the cure of fearfulness. For one thing, the disciples were afraid because they were caught up in a situation with which they were quite unable to cope. It is perhaps the worst of all fears to feel our own utter weakness and our own utter powerlessness and our own utter inadequacy to deal with the situation in which we find ourselves. So long as there is something to which we can hold things are at least tolerable. But when it seems that there is nothing to which we may hold and that there is no way of coping with things in general then there comes fear. Conrad tells of sailing the sea in the midst of a terrific storm. He had come close to the boatswain from the sheer need of human companionship. Through the wind he shouted to the man, 'Blows very hard, boatswain.' His answer was, 'Ay, and if it blows only a little harder things will begin to go. I don't mind as long as everything holds, but when things begin to go it's bad.' When things began to go there would be nothing left but to drift helplessly before the elements. Just so when a man gets caught up in a situation which he feels himself powerless to deal with and to cope with then comes fear. It was precisely that that the disciples felt in the storm on the lake and it is precisely that that many people feel to-day.

But this fear goes deeper than that in these times. There is in many human minds and hearts not only the feeling that we are incapable of dealing with the situation but that the situation is out of control. The basic fear is not so much that we cannot control things but that God has lost control of things. There are those who have a feeling that God's world has, as it were, broken loose and is running amok and that even God is powerless to deal with things. Some one tells of a child on a night when a violent gale was blowing. 'Daddy,' said the child, 'God has lost hold of the wind to-night.' So there are those who in troubled times find it hard to believe either in the love or in the power of God. Zoroastrianism had as its fundamental doctrine the belief that in the universe there is going on a ceaseless struggle between the power of light and the power of darkness; and at the root of the fear in many a heart is the thought that the power of light has lost the struggle and that the power of darkness is closing in.

So then the first cure for fear is quite simply belief in Almighty God. What is needed is the kind of belief that the writer of the forty-sixth Psalm had. 'Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.' It is the kind of belief that the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah lays down. Cyrus might never have heard of

Jehovah and Cyrus might seem to be running amok; yet the fact remained that Cyrus, quite unwittingly and quite unconsciously, was in the control of the purposes of God and was working out the plan of God.

One of the great answers of history was given by Luther to the Cardinal legate at Augsburg. The Pope had sent the Cardinal to compel Luther by any means to recant. Everything—bribes and entreaties and threats—had been tried and had been tried in vain. The Cardinal was amazed that any one should so withstand the command and the might of the Pope. 'Do you think the Pope cares for the opinion of a German boor?' demanded the Cardinal. 'The Pope's little finger is stronger than all Germany. Do you expect your princes to take up arms to defend you? I tell you, no! And where will you be then?' 'Then as now,' said Luther, 'in the hands of Almighty God.'

Again and again we glibly take this phrase, Almighty God, upon our lips without fully realizing what it means. If it means anything it means that things cannot slip out of God's control. It means that God in His own way is working His own purpose out. As Froude laid it down, 'One lesson and only one history may be said to repeat with distinctness; that the world is built somehow on moral foundations; that in the long run it is well with the good; in the long run it is ill with the wicked. But this is no science; it is no more than the old doctrine taught long ago by the Hebrew prophets.' To cure our fears we need to lay hold again on the certainty of the power of God. We need to sing with a new kind of belief Faber's lines:

> For right is right, since God is God;
> And right the day must win;
> To doubt would be disloyalty,
> To falter would be sin.

But further to gain the real cure for fear we must not only believe in the almightiness of God but we must believe that that power of God can come and dwell within a man in such a way that it will make him master of all things. When Peter and John were brought before the Council to answer for their deeds and for their words the rulers were astonished at their boldness. Here were men with no kind of learning, with no kind of influence, and with no kind of backing. They were facing the wisest and the most influential and the most powerful people of their country. And yet these ignorant and unlettered men, in face of all that, were obviously masters of the situation and obviously without fear. Wherein lay their secret? There can have been no more terrorizing age for Christians than the age of which the Book of Acts relates the history; and in that book there is one article of the faith which recurs again and again. It is the centre and the core of all early Christian preaching. It is the Resurrection of Christ. These men had discovered something. They had discovered by personal experience that Jesus Christ was not one who had lived and died and passed on. He was not a figure of the past however heroic and however great. He was not a great character in past history. He was not a figure to be remembered. He was a powerful present reality. He was with them as really as any one could ever be with them; and in that presence and that power there was an end of fear.

Let those who live in an atmosphere of fearfulness rediscover the fact of the power of Almighty God. Let them rediscover not only the fact of the power of God but the experience of the presence of the living Christ, and in that power and in that presence fear will turn to faith and faith will abolish fearfulness in a new-found confidence.

It is, however, one thing to state a remedy and to recommend a cure. It is another thing to say where that remedy and where that cure is to be found. How are we to make this rediscovery of God's power and how are we to gain this new experience of the presence of the living Christ? It is here that there is a lesson which our own age finds it hard to learn. We live in a time which believes above all things in action. We must ever be doing something. But in life there must be kept a place and a time for receiving, for waiting, and for communing with God. 'Be still,' said the Psalmist, 'and know that I am God.' 'They that wait upon the Lord,' said the Prophet, 'shall renew their strength.' When in life we learn to depend less on our own almost frenzied effort and to spend more time in the practice of the presence of God we shall gain more strength and more confidence. A man can only face life fearlessly in action when he emerges from the stillness of waiting wherein he has laid hold on God and companied with Christ.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Patience.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE M. DRYBURGH, M.A., GLASGOW.

'We give thanks to God . . . Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.'—1 Th $1^{2, 3}$.

You will notice here the famous trinity of Christian graces, Faith, Love, Hope—in that order. But do not miss how strikingly the practical nature of each is set before us. Faith shows itself by work—for faith without works is dead. Love shows itself by labour, literally, by laboriousness, that is, by the trouble it takes, so that it is something far more than an emotion that stirs the heart, like a breeze sweeping a lake. And then Hope is something of tougher fibre than wishful thinking, which is liable to vanish into confusion and despair when things do not turn out as we had wished. No, it is a hope that is so steadfastly fixed and anchored to its object that it is sure to come true, and therefore we can wait with patience for its fulfilment. That is the kind of hope Christian hope is, and patience is the evidence of its presence, just as deeds are the evidence of faith and labour the proof of love.

The object on which Christian hope is anchored is Jesus Christ—the risen, living, triumphant Christ, who is to come again in glory and power to reign for ever and ever: that is the glowing centre of the hope of these Thessalonian Christians. Of that they have no doubt and they show their hope by the way they patiently wait for it. 'We are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.' That is what Paul wrote to the Christians at Rome, speaking of the great final transformation Christ was going to effect; 'with patience wait for it.' And so it is always, right through Scripture. Patience and Hope travel the road of life together. Thus, if you would learn Patience, see first to having some Hope within you. Patience is a lovely name for that quality of quiet enduring till Hope brings our feet through the gate of the City we seek.

But if you would see how wondrous and high a thing is Patience, you must see it in the heart of God Himself. The history of the world is the story of God's Patience. Mankind, wilful, breaking forth from Paradise, the garden of holy peace, determined, as we still are, to go our own way—what a tragedy it is! Appalled by the mass of sheer wickedness, the nameless evils in which men persistently wallow, have you not ever asked why does not God destroy the world in its perversity? The answer is—His Patience. He puts up with us beyond all we feel credible, that His long-suffering may lead us to repentance. You see how Abraham reverently and prayerfully and pleadingly tests the depths of God's Patience. 'And the Lord said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes.' But down deeper still goes the plummet of Abraham's prayer into the deeps of God's long-suffering Patience. 'For forty's sake? . . . For thirty's sake? . . . For twenty's sake?' And, then, farther out he pushes his little craft, 'Oh let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak yet but this once: Peradventure ten shall be found there.' And he waits, breathless—'And God said, I will not destroy it for ten's sake.' The Patience of Hope! But look at the next verse—'And the Lord went his way . . . and Abraham returned unto his place.' As the chapter closes we are conscious of a deep and awesome silence.

And is not Israel's own history the story of the Patience of God? Note how again and again they bring woe on themselves and 'then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and he saved them out of their distresses.' And how He led them back across the desert from exile in Babylon, whence their sins had banished them, quietly opening the door of new hope for them in their own land!

But there comes a day when that infinitely deep Patience of God is born into the world of men in Jesus Christ. For He is the incarnation of the divine Patience. His whole life is one of patience with all sorts and conditions of men, with their want of faith, their dullness of understanding, their lack of love. And how He bore with the hostility of His enemies! One writer exhorts his fellow-Christians to 'consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin.' He did! Patience that drew blood! What a rebuke to the indolent, unperturbed indifference *we* call Patience!

In these days of speed craze we have need to remember that with our God one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day. How we tend, even in things of the Spirit, to hurry the pace and force the issue! 'I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts: for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant . . . and I, even I only, am left. . . .' That querulous evangelical discontent that drives us to an angry or a sulky despair of men! In that great and terrible scene in *The Brothers Karamazov* the Old Inquisitor of Spain, close on ninety, is confronted by Christ returned in the guise of a Prisoner and rebukes Him for rejection, at His temptations, of the only way to make rebellious men happy, to take away their freedom and compel them to believe. 'Thou didst not come down from the Cross, when they shouted to Thee, mocking and reviling Thee, "Come down from the cross and we will believe that Thou art He." Thou didst not come down, for again Thou wouldst not enslave men by a miracle, and didst crave faith given freely, not based on miracle. Thou didst crave for free love and not the base raptures of the slave before the might that has overawed him for ever.' He came to seek and to save that which was lost, and He came from the God of all Hope. That is why He does not cry aloud nor lift up His voice in the streets in wholesale condemnation.

After their forsaking Him in the Garden and all that followed, the judgment hall, the crown of thorns, the Cross, He comes back to them. He cannot let them go. 'I go afishing'—'Yes, Peter, but I'll be on the shore waiting when your boat comes in.' It is ever the same, this Patience of God. 'While he was yet a great way off, his father saw him and ran. . . .' He hoped he would come back. 'I'm sure he'll come some day.' And many an evening he slipped out behind the steading where he could see the long road till it lost itself in the land of far distances. 'No, not yet, not yet!' they heard him say to himself, many, many a night. And then one evening just at sundown! That is God.

It's true, and not merely a beautiful story. For after the days of His parables were over and He hung there amid a hostile mob that despised and rejected Him, within an hour of His last agonizing cry He yet heard the whisper from that other cross—'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' How ready He is to see, to hear, to welcome the turning of the dying thief—'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise'—surely the crowning reward of His life-long Patience of Hope. 'Even while resting,' says

Adolf Saphir, of His sitting wearied by the well, 'even while resting He had His loins girt and His lamp burning.' That lamp of patient Hope which He carried lit the feet of the dying thief through the valley of the shadow. Patience, you see, is not at all dumb and stoic resignation. It waits with expectation; it has loins girt and moves out to follow that which seems to the earthly eye but a phantom looming up out of the unseen. It goes all through the night, seeking, toiling, suffering and never, even when he returns, saying what it cost Him, everything forgotten in the twin joy of finding and being found.

I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;
I fled Him, down the arches of the years;
I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways
Of my own mind; and in the mist of tears
I hid from Him, and under running laughter

always hiding and fleeing.

From those strong Feet that followed, followed after.

Isn't that your story and mine? And then, one day—O blessed day!—

Halts by me that footfall:
Is my gloom, after all,
Shade of His hand, outstretched caressingly?
'Ah, fondest, blindest, weakest,
I am He Whom thou seekest!
Thou dravest love from thee, who dravest Me.'

And that is how we get Patience into our own hearts. The saints are those who have caught something of the long, deep Patience of God, which lived and suffered and died for men, and which sought and found them. Their path through the night of affliction and trial is lit by the Hope that burns in their heart, and in the darkness they are cheered by a voice that whispers: 'I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos.'

Preaching the Gospel and the Propaganda of the Christian Social Movement.

By the Reverend Gilbert Clive Binyon, Healey Vicarage, Masham, Ripon.

The relation between the evangelistic or mission work of preaching the Gospel and the mission or propaganda of the Christian Social Movement has often been discussed; and diverse answers to the question have been given. Some have regarded those Christians who take part in the Social Movement as forsaking the true Gospel and dabbling in something that is political rather than religious; others have talked of the 'social implications' of the Gospel as a kind of extra tacked on to it; others again have tried to develop a 'Social Gospel.' I think that each of these views contains *some* truth—*and* some error; and therefore cannot accept any of them. It is the purpose of this article to suggest an approach to this question that may be helpful to some.

The approach suggested consists in a recognition that the religious, moral, and social life of man develops in stages, exists in various phases or on different levels; and that it is necessary to keep all these levels going, not to turn away from any of them, not to separate them or confuse them, but keep them distinct yet related, in their proper sequence one after another or one above another. Perhaps it will be helpful if I give an example of what I have in mind. As we all know, in the period between the wars, there was a great deal of unemployment. A common phrase was 'Starving in the midst of plenty'; that would be a description of it on one level, that of common sense and natural reasoning powers. But mass unemployment could also be described, with indignation or with pity, as something unjust, positively wrong, contrary to the moral law of God; that would be on the level of the Law and the Prophets. But again, one might speak of unemployment as a desecration of the divine image in man, an affront to the majesty of God, something literally damnable, that is, under the wrath of God. That would be a religious interpretation.

Shall we label these three levels, to start with, as social, moral, and religious?—not very exact language, perhaps, but these labels may serve for the moment. For anyone on the level or in the mood of religion, the chief things will be worship, faith, faithfulness—but these, of course, will carry an ethic in their train, and this in turn will issue in political, economic, social decisions and actions. On the moral level, attention will be focused rather on right, justice, and so on, believed in as being derived from religion and as themselves the source of a right ordering of society. On the social level, it is this last—the actual social order in its visible manifestations in the here and now, in all

their variety and detail, that occupies the centre of interest, though they will of course be viewed in the light of moral distinctions and with some reference to religion in the background. These three levels might be said to correspond—in a rough and ready comparison, that might not bear close inspection!—to three stages of religious development—that of General Revelation or Natural Religion and Ethic; the particular Revelation recorded in the Law and the Prophets; and the final Revelation in the Gospel.

General Revelation is that Light which, coming into the world, lightens every man; Natural Religion and Ethic is man's response to this. There is in every man some idea of God, however vaguely conceived of; some idea of justice and right and wrong, however uncertain; some consciousness of an ordered life that is proper to human nature as such.

Unfortunately, many Christian believers only perceive the vagueness and uncertainty of this Natural Religion and Ethic, and do not recognize its value as man's response to the Light that lightens every man, and so ignore its importance as the basis for further response to the fuller Revelation recorded in the Bible. But of course that is a mistake. On the other hand, many people regard this Natural level of belief and practice as the true and sufficient religion, or even as true Christianity as distinguished from the false kind overlaid by the unintelligible and useless dogmas of the Church. And of course that is another mistake. But if we are to avoid these mistakes, it is necessary to give this level of Natural Religion and Ethic its right and proper place within Christianity, neither undervaluing it nor overrating it. It is given its right and proper place in the Bible. The occasion of the Revelation given through Moses was the affliction of God's people in Egypt and their cry by reason of their task-masters. 'I have heard . . . I am come down to deliver . . .' saith the Lord. Here we see man's natural religious and moral perceptions, his indignation against oppression, his sense of justice; and we also see how the further Revelation through Moses confirms and develops this, and carries it on to a fuller understanding. In the Old Testament we read the story of how God's prophets struggled for a fuller response to the purposes of the God who had brought His people out of Egypt; and of how the lawgivers strove to make Israel's ordered social life correspond to those purposes. There was to be justice between man and man—not simply because men wanted it, but—because the Lord required it. This, then, is the second stage—the 'moral' level of the Law and the Prophets.

I pointed out just now that many Christian people fail to give due weight to the Natural level, while other people overvalue it. In a similar way, it must now be pointed out that some good Christian people, when they meet with a striving for justice in this world, an effort to get built in some future period of history a new and Christian social order, are inclined to regard it with pity as a pathetic attempt to realize the impossible dream of an earthly paradise—what people should be doing, such folk would say, is to be thinking of the Kingdom of Heaven. But there is a mistake there somewhere, is there not? On the other hand, many people nowadays are inclined to identify the Kingdom of Heaven with an ideal future in human history, and to consider this belief as a vast improvement on 'sky-piloting.' But there is a mistake there too, is there not? And if we are to avoid those two mistakes, we must give this level of the Law and the Prophets its right and proper place, as preparatory to the Gospel. The Gospel of the Incarnation, of Redemption, of the Kingdom of Heaven is the good news of God's intervention in human history, of God coming to man's rescue, of the heavenly world breaking in on the visible world.

It used to be necessary—and still is, in some quarters—to point out that we pray 'Thy Kingdom come' and not 'May we be taken to heaven.' Now, it seems, it is necessary to point out that we pray 'Thy Kingdom come' and not 'May we build the Kingdom of heaven on earth.' When God's Kingdom comes, there will be a new earth to match the new heaven; it will be the end of the world as it is, the consummation of the age, the transfiguration of the cosmos; men will neither marry nor be given in marriage, but will be equal to the angels.

There is a collect in the Anglican Prayer Book which will, I think, put us right on this point: 'O Lord Jesus Christ, who at thy first coming didst send thy messenger to prepare thy way before thee; Grant that the ministers and stewards of thy mysteries may likewise so prepare and make ready thy way, by turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that at thy second coming to judge the world we may be found an acceptable people in thy sight. . . .'

If I am right, the Christian Social Movement is to be thought of, not as an attempt to build God's Kingdom on earth, but as an attempt to turn the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that when God brings in His Kingdom Himself, we may be found an acceptable people in His sight.

If one sets out these stages in historical sequence, one after another, one must notice that the earlier stages are not left behind and abolished when the next is reached; they are, rather, 'fulfilled' and in some sense remain as permanent substructure.

So one may also set them out as phases, in psychological sequence, one above another.

The highest level is, properly, only represented in Christ Himself; yet is more or less attained by those who, in Pauline phrase, are 'in Christ.'

If the Christian Social enterprise is the A.D. counterpart of that of the prophets that were before Christ, this will belong to the second or middle level described above as that of the Law and the Prophets. But when it comes to practical politics and to implementing these ideals in actual administration of affairs in a community of all kinds of people, that will necessarily go on the assumptions of Natural Religion and Ethic.

It has already become plain, I expect, that it will never do to separate these phases and levels; to keep the Gospel, worship, religious faith and faithfulness quite apart from the social ideals of the Law and the Prophets—that has been the error of the last three or four hundred years, has it not? And to keep one's ideals quite out of contact with practical politics—that would be Utopianism (in the bad sense), would it not? But, then, it should be equally clear that it will never do to mix them all up! So they must be kept distinct, yet related—practical politics as an attempt to carry out as far as possible the ideals which derive from religion.

Here it must be said that in real life as we actually know it, the people we meet display an almost endless diversity; their capacities vary greatly, and also their use of them; their upbringing and their experiences are extremely diverse; some have gone a long way in one direction, but have made little or no progress in others; and so on. Thus there must be something a little artificial and abstract about this three-fold classification. Moreover, in any case, the three stages or levels merge into one another. Sometimes I have compared them in my own mind to the three states of matter as exemplified in ice, water, and steam; and that comparison may have its uses—but one must not forget the melting and boiling stages. Perhaps a better comparison would be that of a lamp turned low and dim—or turned up more brightly—or shining with dazzling brilliance; this allows for infinite gradations between.

So one must not expect this idea of the three stages or levels to quite fit the facts in daily life. None the less, it may be useful in clarifying thought. So let us try to see whether this idea of three levels, distinct yet related, can help us at all.

Sir Richard Acland, in a chapter contributed to a book called *Towards a Christian Order* (p. 154) speaks of a 'moral, spiritual and religious mission to the British people.' He also elsewhere (*Malvern*, p. 153) utters a warning about the opposition that must be expected; and tells us how he came to realize that what was required was an attempted reproduction, however feeble, of the Old Testament prophets. All this agrees with what I have just said about the missionary, propagandist, effort of the Christian Social Movement being on the middle level, the A.D. equivalent of B.C. prophecy. Of course, there will be a difference; where the prophets looked back to the Exodus from Egypt, Christians look back to the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, and so on; but this mission about the regeneration of the social order belongs to the level of the Law and the Prophets, and not to that of the Gospel. It is easy to think otherwise and in reaction against a next-worldly gospel to preach a this-worldly one; but that is to play into the hands of those who regard any sort of 'Christian Socialism' as a secularization of religion. What, then, will be the relation of the Gospel level to this moral one, this mission? The right relation, I answer, is displayed in a two-fold influence it will have; the distinctively Christian Gospel will influence this mission in two ways, as to the *standpoint*, point of view, and basis of action, and as to the *nature of the mission* itself.

(1) Everyone necessarily belongs to many groups, his family, his class, his trade or profession, his nation or race, and so on; but for the Christian, he is essentially a 'member of Christ'; his citizenship is in heaven. Although for various purposes and on appropriate occasions, he takes his place as a member of some particular class or nation, membership in these or any other groups will be subordinate to his membership in the Mystical Body of Christ, the whole company of faithful people; and these groups will be, not so much groups to which he owes allegiance as spheres for him to influence. Thus there will be a lively consciousness of the relation between States as something which affects the nature of each State; so there will be no danger of passing insensibly and unawares from 'Christian Socialism' to National Socialism!

(2) The mission will be felt to be a witness to or a proclamation of God's Plans and Purposes. The detailed programme will be set forth as the nearest approximation that can be reached, according to such wisdom as may have been given, to an understanding of the Divine Plan and Purpose. Thus there will be no easy, light-hearted acceptance of it as of some infallible oracle, nor any difficult heartbreaking correction or alteration of it, if that should be required. In one word, the Gospel gives 'detachment'—from self, from the world, from the groupings of race, nation, class or party, from detailed programmes; the supreme loyalty is to God and the Advent of His Kingdom. It makes all the difference, in times of disillusionment and disappointment,

whether one's ideals are one's own make, which one has calmly identified with God's Will, or whether, on the other hand, one consciously recognizes them as one's own apprehension, probably faulty, of God's Plans.

Now, if from this 'Gospel' basis, and in accordance with the 'Prophetic Mission,' some programme of 'Practical Politics' is drawn up, it must necessarily run counter to many established habits of thought and action, and so will not at once be immediately practicable.

It is very interesting to notice the various reactions of different persons to this situation, *i.e.*, the clash between an idealist programme and established habits of thought and action. Let us think of two such reactions. One man will at once conclude that these habits of thought and action must be changed, people must learn to think and behave differently, there must be a great educational, propagandist, missionary campaign. But another will say, as though there could be no choice in the matter: 'We might adopt this programme in principle, but of course it won't do as it is; people would never stand it; we must adapt it.' This second reaction introduces us to the third level, and it seems to me to be of the utmost importance that the relation of this level to the others should be got right. There is always a possibility, nay more, the probability, that those who take one of these courses and embark on the missionary campaign, will feel a deep repugnance to the other, will feel they can't touch pitch without being defiled, and that if they take to practical politics they will be letting themselves in for a series of demoralizing concessions which will at last end in the complete failure of the mission and loss of the ideal.

On the other hand, the more practical minded, eager to get something done, will be impatient of the idea that they are 'watering down' the programme, and come to resent any such comment, and regard the mission-propagandist as first irritating, then mischievous.

If propagandist and practical reformers were thus to drift quite apart, that would in the end reduce the former to Utopian dreamers letting off steam, and the latter to quite uninspired administrators doing solid work, no doubt, but cold as ice.

That may call to mind, perhaps, something said above, about comparing the three levels to steam, water, and ice, and about the point at which steam condenses into water, and water boils, and the point at which water freezes and ice melts.

These are the very points to which the reader's attention is called!—that is, to the difficult art of letting each of these three levels, or degrees of intensity, of man's religio-moral-social life be rightly represented in one's own personal life, so that they are kept distinct yet not separated, related yet not confused. Every one, I suppose, feels naturally more at home on one level or another, and may have his particular vocation there. But a condition of the vitality and fruitfulness of that vocation is that one should plunge into the other levels, however distasteful they may seem, even if one soon comes back again out of them. This *alternating* will tend to melt the ice and condense the steam, resolve the clash between idealistic programmes and established habits of thought and action.

The practice of this art, is, of course, the subject-matter of casuistry, which deals with the question of what ought to be done in particular cases. Among many people casuistry has a bad reputation and I venture to say that that is no bad thing; but I also say that it is unfortunate to the last degree if there is nothing to take its place. One may mention here some words in Solomon's prayer (1 K 8^{59}) in which Divine direction is asked for 'day by day as the matter shall require.'

It is important, too, to note that the three levels do not perfectly fit together, so to speak; there is a certain jolting in the passage from one to another, a confusion at the melting and boiling, the condensing and freezing points. This can be illustrated thus: thinking on the social level, we may say that such and such a party or nation or class has more right in its habits of thought and action than another; but if we concentrate on the moral characteristics, we can't help discovering that the areas of goodness and badness, of right and wrong, do not precisely fit the social groupings; every group has some error mixed up with it. And if we go on up to the religious level, we see that there is none that doeth good, and that no man living is justified except by faith.

But the preaching of the Gospel must take account of the lower levels; each of the three must be there in its rightful place; they must be kept distinguished, yet related.

Recent Foreign Theology.

In 1938 Professor J. Coppens, of the University of Louvain, published in book form three chapters which had appeared earlier in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, under the title *L'Histoire Critique de l'Ancien Testament*. In 1942 this was published in America in a revised English translation,[1] but the revision, which was completed in 1939, was not substantial. In 1942 a much fuller revision of the work appeared in French, under a slightly changed title.[2] The fact that so many editions have been called for suggests that it is a work of some importance, for it is a scholarly and technical piece of work of the kind that does not commonly call for frequent editions. It is significant because it is a masterly survey of the history of the Higher Criticism, particularly of the Pentateuch, by an enlightened Catholic scholar of broad outlook and understanding. Some reviewers have seen only Catholic conservatism here, but the present writer sees the precise opposite. It is true that the weaknesses of the Wellhausen position are seized on and exposed, but that is not surprising. For its theological presuppositions are to-day widely abandoned even by those who accept, in the main, its critical achievements, while even those critical achievements are widely challenged by modern writers whose challenge rests on no mere adherence to tradition. But the discriminating reader will perceive that though Professor Coppens rejects the results of the Higher Criticism more largely than many of us, its method is admitted to be legitimate, and the author interprets the decisions of the Biblical Commission in the most favourable sense possible, from the point of view of critical scholarship, and pleads for greater freedom for Catholic scholars. He urges that the place of critical study should vary at different levels of instruction, but claims that in University instruction and in research scholarship should be thoroughly critical.

The first chapter traces the rise of the Higher Criticism to its classic formulation in Wellhausen. The second chapter unfolds the present position, with its many new lines of approach, and its many challenges to Wellhausen's positions by scholars of widely different schools. It is this second chapter which has been most largely re-written and expanded, to bring it fully up to date. The third chapter sketches lines of future development to which the author looks forward.

Quite apart from its own critical positions, the book is without peer as an objective account of the work which has been done, and as a guide to the literature of the subject—including much continental work of the earlier war years which is not available in this country. Professor Coppens seems to have read everything that has been written on the subject, and while his text is a mine of information, his footnotes are of superb bibliographical value.

Mention may be made of some other recent publications of Professor Coppens, which are only now available here. In 1941 he edited a posthumous study by A. Van Hoonacker of Egger's *Absolute and Relative Truth of the Holy Scriptures*,[3] in which the recognition of the inspiration of the Bible is held to be fully consistent with the denial of its complete inerrancy. In 1942 he issued a review of exegesis of the years 1939–1942,[4] in which a surprising number of books which appeared during those years are reviewed. In 1943 he issued a little collection of Biblical studies.[5] The first is a study of Ps 110[7], in which the emendation החיל בדרך ישת is advocated for MT מנחל בדרך ישתה, yielding the sense ' The army stands ready in the way.' The second is a study of Gn 3[22], to which is given the rather forced meaning ' Behold Adam and whosoever will be born from him will have to experience good and ill.' The third takes up the question ' Where lay Paradise ? ' and reaches the conclusion that it lay far to the east. The fourth deals with the number of wonderful trees in the Garden of Eden, and rejects the view of de Boer[6] that the term for the tree of life is collective, indicating many such trees. The first two of these studies are written in French and the last two in Flemish. In Flemish, too, Professor Coppens has published a study of the Papal Encyclical *Providentissimus* (1943).[7]

In collaboration with the sisters of Vorselaar, he has also issued a short outline course of lessons on the Old Testament for use in schools.[8] In general it treats the Bible uncritically, in accordance with the author's above-mentioned principle that at the lower levels criticism is out of place, and concentrates on the religious message of the Old Testament. Sometimes it resorts to an allegorical interpretation, as when the wars of David are made to prefigure the triumphs of Christ. That we for our profit may find godly lessons in Old Testament history does not mean that events happened in order to provide these

[1] *The Old Testament and the Critics*. St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J. (1942).

[2] *Histoire Critique des Livres de l'Ancien Testament*. Desclée, de Brouwer, Bruges (1942).

[3] *Quelques Notes sur 'Absolute und Relative Wahrheit in der Heiligen Schrift.'* Bijbelsch Seminarie, Louvain (1941).

[4] *Chronique d'Exégèse* 1939–1942. Bijbelsch Seminarie, Louvain (1942).

[5] *Miscellanées Bibliques VII.–X.* Louvain (1943). This is Fasc. 16 of the *Bulletin d'histoire et d'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament*, and the two previous studies are Nos. 14 and 15 of the same series.

[6] *Genesis ii. en iii. Het verhaal van der hof in Eden*, by P. A. H. de Boer. Brill, Leyden (1941).

[7] *De Jongste Bijbelencycliek*. Off-printed from *Ons Geloof* (1945).

[8] *Histoire religieuse de l'Ancien Testament*. Desclée, de Brouwer, Bruges (1945).

lessons. The first four chapters deal with the geographical and historical background. Here it is surprising to find that the subject is treated entirely without reference to our extra-Biblical knowledge, which is to-day so considerable, especially since these outlines are for a 'Cours supérieur.' The next five chapters are on sin, and are followed by eight chapters on messianic prophecy, and ten chapters on Old Testament theology. The present writer feels that messianic prophecy receives a somewhat disproportionate emphasis, but thinks the deeply religious note which runs through the book one which might well be copied in our own similar handbooks, as also might the simple setting forth of the main teachings of Old Testament theology attempted in the concluding chapters. Too often a critical study of Old Testament literature and history wholly displaces any study of the religious message of the Old Testament.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

Contributions and Comments.

Some Bits of Hebrew.

IV.

Texts in Job.

In Job 22^{11} the LXX are said to have read אורך. Surely they read אור לך—unless, indeed, they read לך in the place of לא.

In Job 23^{10}, if with Steuernagel we punctuate עמדי as infinitive with suffix, the meaning of ידע דרך עמדי will be 'he knows in what direction I stand,' in which quarter to look for me, in contrast to the seeking to left and right in the preceding verse.

In Job 23^{11-12} the Masoretic text is the relic of one (by which I do not mean to say 'the original one') whose sense would have been expressed by these accents: מחקיו . . . שפתיו . . . : שמרתי. Either מהקו or מחקו, [and ממצות, Ed.].

In Job 24 $^{10a\ 11a}$ one wishes for a closer parallel to the forcible ^{10b}, רעבים נשאו עמר. This would be attained in ^{10a} if we read בבלי, making ערום הלכו בבלי לבוש 'they go naked bearing articles of clothing,' whether one understands this of transportation on the premises or of carrying great bundles long distances for commerce. In ^{11a} the mysterious characters בינשורתם ought then to express the thought of rough hard skin lacking the benefit of oil. We could drop י, possibly ו also, read ב as preposition and ם as suffix referring to the labourers, and have left a noun, otherwise unknown, from the root נשר. In Arabic نسر is the frog of a hoof.

In Job 24^{17} could we divide לם וצלמות and interpret כי יחדו בקר לם וצלמות 'for together (*i.e.* alike) are morning to them and gloom'? The passage would still be difficult and suspicious; but so it is now.

In Rabbinical Hebrew משך is to take possession of a thing by grasping it and drawing it to you, and משיכה is the act of thus taking possession. This act might naturally be expressed in Greek by ἁρπαγμός. But we know that Paul, who had a conversational familiarity with Rabbinical Hebrew, used ἁρπαγμός concretely (Ph 2^{6}) to express the thing grasped at, regarded from the standpoint of its desirability, 'prize' as the E.R.V. expresses it. Now this sense is just what will suit us in משך חכמה מפנינים, Job 28^{18}, 'wisdom is more of a prize than coral.' May we regard Job 28^{18} and Ph 2^{6}, each supposed to be a use without parallel, as parallels to each other with Rabbinical Hebrew as connecting link?

In צרק לבשתי וילבשני, Job 29^{14}, the Masoretic punctuation appears to mean 'I put it on and it put me on.' Nevertheless, some of us would rather have the sense 'and it clad me, became a garment for me.' Can we not get this sense by making וילבשני a Piel?

If in Job 32^{9}, לא רבים יחכמו וזקנים יבינו משפט, we read רבי ימים with the LXX, everything is smooth and we have nothing to worry about—at least if we feel with Duhm that the flattest line is worthiest of Elihu. Nevertheless, if with the Syriac we read רב ימים and then establish parallelism by punctuating זקנים as an abstract noun as in Gn $21^{2.\ 7}$, 37^{3}, 44^{20}, then punctuate יחכמו as Piel and understand this and יבינו causatively, we get a sharper and less trite continuation of the thought of the preceding verse: 'It is not great number of days that makes wise, nor old age that gives understanding of what is right.' If it is charged that this continues the thought in a somewhat dragging way, it is not on that account the less characteristic of Elihu, and his faults are not more glaring in this than in the other extant readings of this text.

It is undoubted that Elihu is addressing the three friends in 32^{6} and Job in 33^{1}. It is assumed too hastily, I think, that the latter verse marks the point at which the address is shifted. I should say that 32^{15} is the point where he turns away from addressing the three and thenceforth addresses Job. Not only does this explain the third person verbs in that verse, and the fact that all connexion breaks there and a fresh start is made, but the identical language of verses ^{10b} and ^{17b} is then

excused by the fact that different persons are addressed. I fear, however, no re-paragraphing will exonerate Elihu from the charge of spending too many words on introduction before he really begins talking.

It seems over-optimistic to say there is no difficulty in למתים, 33^{22}. Could there have been a synonym for Sheol formed by applying to the root for death the local preformative Mem?

The Piel of בצע seems to have been the technical verb for cutting off the woven cloth from the thrum left in the loom (Is 38^{12}). This meaning, with God as subject, seems to give a better effect in Job 27^{8}, כי יבצע כי ישל אלוה נפשו, than the unspecialized 'cut off' which commentators assume there. If with Oort and Budde we point as Pual or Niphal, still the figure of the loom should be recognized.

In ברוחו שמים שפרה, Job 26^{13}, I see that Dhorme, whose book I have not at hand, renders שפרה as a verb meaning 'sweep bare' as if by a broom. I do not know whether Dhorme compares the Arabic; but this is precisely the sense of the Arabic verb, and the Arabic also knows the metaphorical application to the wind sweeping the clouds off the sky. To accept the Arabic use (there are several apparent Arabisms in Job) seems better than to assume that the Hebrew expressed the same idea indirectly and more obscurely. If we make the wind the subject, of course, we assume dittography of ב.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

Ballard Vale, Mass., U.S.A.

Inaccurate Repetitions in the Fourth Gospel.

IT is a characteristic of the Fourth Gospel that it frequently gives certain sayings twice over. For example, the words of Jesus in 13^{16} ('A servant is not greater than his lord') re-appear in 15^{20}: 'Remember the word that I said unto you, A servant is not greater than his lord.' In this case the words are repeated correctly; but there are numerous examples where, although the saying is given and repeated in direct speech, the language is varied—sometimes slightly and at other times so much that older commentators wondered if some other unrecorded saying was being quoted. Even when the first version must have been beneath the eyes of the writer, he shows no interest in verbal accuracy as long as the meaning is conveyed.

(1) Jn 1^{30}: 'This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is become before me: for he was before me.'
But the words had previously been reported in the following form, 1^{15}: 'He that cometh after me is become before me; for he was before me.'

(2) 3^{7}: '. . . I said unto thee, Ye must be born anew.'
But the words were actually, 3^{3}: 'Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'

(3) 3^{28}: 'Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but, that I am sent before him.'
The reference is evidently to 1^{20} ('I am not the Christ') and 1^{23} ('I am the voice of one crying,' etc.).

(4) 6^{36}: 'But I said unto you, that ye have seen me, and yet believe not.'
The reference here is uncertain. The R.V. margin suggests, with a question mark, *v.*^{26}. The comment of Euthymius is interesting: *πότε δὲ τοῦτο εἶπεν αὐτοῖς; εἰκὸς τοῦτο ῥηθῆναι μὲν μὴ γραφῆναι δέ.*

(5) 6^{65}: 'And he said, For this cause have I said unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of the Father.'
But the words referred to were: 'No man can come to me, except the Father which sent me draw him' (6^{44}).

(6) 8^{52}: '. . . and thou sayest, If a man keep my word, he shall never taste of death.'
But what Jesus said was: 'If a man keep my word, he shall never see death' (8^{51}).

(7) 9^{23}: 'Therefore said his parents, He is of age; ask him.'
What the parents actually said was: 'Ask him; he is of age,' etc. (9^{21}).

(8) 11^{40}: 'Said I not unto thee, that if thou believedst, thou shouldest see the glory of God?'
The reference here is uncertain; it may be to $11^{25.\ 26}$.

(9) 12^{34}: '. . . how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up?'
But what Jesus said was: 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me' (12^{32}).

(10) 13^{10}: '. . . ye are clean, but not all.'
13^{11}: 'Therefore said he, Ye are not all clean.'

(11) 13^{25}: 'He leaning back, as he was, on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it?'
The words are quoted in 21^{20}: '. . . which also leaned back on his breast at the supper, and said, Lord, who is he that betrayeth thee?'

(12) 14^{28}: 'Ye heard how I said to you, I go away, and I come unto you.'
The reference here is uncertain; it may be to 14^{3}: 'If I go . . . I come again.'

(13) 16^{14}: 'He shall take (λήμψεται) of mine, and shall declare it unto you.'
16^{15}: 'Therefore said I, that he taketh (λαμβάνει) of mine, and shall declare it unto you.'

(14) 16^{16}: 'A little while, and ye behold me no more.'
16^{17}: 'What is this that he saith unto us, A little while, and ye behold me not.'

(15) 17^{12}: 'While I was with them, I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me:

and I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition.'

18[9]: 'That the word might be fulfilled which he spake, Of those whom thou hast given me I lost not one.'

Could the writer tell us more plainly that he is not concerned with literal exactness but with the essential meaning? T. F. Glasson.

Windsor.

οὐά. Mark xv. 29: A Suggestion.

Most visitors in the Near East, whether they spend their days in Cairo or Jerusalem, or in smaller places, gradually become accustomed to some of the more familiar and frequent expressions heard in the 'high ways' or the 'by-ways.' One of these is *'ua'* (أوعى), used perhaps by the driver of an *'arabiyya* on the Jaffa Road or the rider of a donkey or camel in less crowded thoroughfares. The point is that the driver or rider has found some one in the path of his own progress, and desires to call attention to the fact that the individual apostrophized is running the risk of a collision or minor accident, and, once he has heard the *'ua'*, must assume all responsibility should such occur. The word itself grammatically is an Imperative (it is also heard in the feminine or plural in accordance with circumstances) and tells the person so addressed that it is now up to him to look after himself, for he has had due warning, or else must count on Allah looking after him. Might we have a possible key here to the use of οὐά in Mk 15[29]? The word might be translated 'wake up,' 'look out,' 'beware.' It is a summons to take notice of facts as they are or, rather, have become.

Matthew makes no attempt to render this Markan word. Luke omits the reference to the destroying of the Temple. The Latin of D leaves it out. In the Vulgate it would seem to have been 'Va.' Practically all the Arabic versions till Van Dyck make nothing of it. Some MSS. of less importance have added an iota (οὐάϊ). While it is true, however, that οὐά is found in Epictetus [1] and other Greek writers, is it necessary to consider it only a Greek word, with the implication of 'wonder, real or ironical'? Wonder hardly seems to fit the case, much less admiration. The English equivalents of 'Ah' or 'Ha' scarcely meet the case. Might we not perhaps have in this verse the actual word that those 'who passed by' said in their blasphemy, given in Greek transliteration rather than translation, as in other cases in Mark? It is two syllables anyhow—not one. The Greeks habitually refused to render the ع; so that it is a very fair attempt to reproduce an expression that might have had vogue in more than one of the languages of the Near East. The root in Arabic is fairly wide, but does not seem to have a parallel Hebrew. The people involved in the exclamation, some of whom would seem to have been present at the Trial when the story of 'destroying the Temple' was brought in, on this occasion 'spared neither words nor gestures of derision.' They may even have realized that the witness at the trial had not been such as to be unanimous; and this would give extra bitterness to the taunt: 'οὐά: it is your own "look out" now: you, who destroy the Temple and build it in three days.' Eric F. F. Bishop.

[1] *Moulton and Milligan*, 464.

Thabor, Jerusalem.

δοκοῦντες = 'aspire.'

In Dr. Manson's *The Teaching of Jesus*, Detached note D, he argues successfully I think for 'aspire' as the meaning of 'dokountes.' It seems to me that this thought can well be applied in the translation of 1 Co 11[16] where 'But if any man seemeth to be contentious,' seems a weak statement. Anyone who has lived or worked with a contentious person is not in doubt on the subject. So that it would seem preferable to translate 'dokei' by 'purposes' or 'is determined to be contentious' to bring out the real meaning. So far as Paul was concerned, if there was going to be a racket over the subject he would just drop it.

In one or two other places the improvement may not be so noticeable or others may not think it an improvement at all, but a changed translation is at least suggestive as in 1 Co 10[12], 'Wherefore let him that purposes to stand take heed lest he fall.' The warning then is addressed not only to the conceited among the Corinthians but to all the Christians there, and becomes a grand piece of advice for every new Christian—or old one too, for that matter.

Also in 1 Co 14[37] is it not possible that the affection and friendliness Paul undoubtedly shows in v.[39] begins here and that the translation might be 'If any man "desires" or "purposes" to be a prophet or spiritual'? The admonition becomes wider.

Again in Lk 8[18] to translate 'dokei' by 'desire' or 'purpose' is suggestive. 'Even what a man purposes to have will be taken from him,' unless according to the previous teaching he takes care to pay attention. Perhaps others have done as I have, planned to find out someone's name, asked for it and then immediately turned to something else, only to find when they tried to recall the name that it was gone. W. R. Hutton.

American Baptist Mission,
Nowgong, Assam, India.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.